

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES
IN DESERTING LITHUANIA FOR MOSCOW,
1377-1514

by

OSWALD PRENTISS BACKUS
Associate Professor of History
University of Kansas

with maps
drawn by

GEORGE FREDERICK JENKS
Associate Professor of Geography
University of Kansas

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PRESS, LAWRENCE, 1957

© 1957 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PRESS
L.C.C.C. Number: 57-10682

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A. BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PRESS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS

TO MY FATHER
OSWALD PRENTISS BACKUS
1883-1956

PREFACE

I have used the Library of Congress system of transliteration of Eastern Slavic languages throughout this book, with the exception that some proper nouns, such as place names and personal names, appear in such other forms as are commonly accepted by Western scholars. All dates are according to the Julian calendar.

Since the preparation of the manuscript of this book, two important works have appeared: Horst Jablonowski, *Westrussland zwischen Wilna und Moskau* (Leiden, 1955) and Gotthold Rhode, *Die Ostgrenze Polens* (Cologne-Graz, 1955), I (see my reviews, *American Historical Review*, LXI, 714-15, LXII, 114-15). Jablonowski's excellent work deals with many of the problems treated in this book and via a different route, the re-examination of the trustworthiness of chronicles, comes to some conclusions which are similar to some presented here. I wish to take this opportunity to stress the significance of Rhode's work. I have doubts as to the feasibility of trying to discover a line of cultural demarcation between Eastern and Western civilizations, but I am impressed with his examination of what people thought about themselves, that is, whether they thought they belonged to the East or to the West. Conversation and re-examination of the implications of disputed phrasings with Rhode have convinced me that, contrary to what I asserted in my review, he has not assumed an identification of the eastern boundary of Poland with the eastern frontier of the West.

Thanks are extended to many persons: especially to George Vernadsky of Yale University for inspiration, encouragement, and many helpful suggestions; to Serge G. Pushkarev of Yale University for painstaking examination and criticism; to Phillip M. Mitchell of the University of Kansas for long hours spent in attacking style; to William D. Paden of the University of Kansas for additional useful stylistic criticisms; to the Editor of the University of Kansas Press for many useful suggestions as to the organization and form of this book; and to Michael Karpovich, H. Gordon Wasson, Peter Charanis, L. Ethan Ellis, Charles B. Realey, James C. Malin, George L. Anderson, Charles C. Cumberland, John H. Nelson, and many others for advice and help.

I am grateful to George F. Jenks, not only for the maps he has drawn for this book but also for instruction in ways a compiler may help to make maps more nearly accurate.

Wanda Sammons, Mary Lou Eklund, Shirley Ann Westwood, Sharon Rhodes, Marilyn Coffelt, and Robert J. Lavey deserve accolades for hours spent in typing or filing, or checking or proofreading or in many of the other numerous tasks which help to transform notes into a published monograph.

Thanks are due especially to the staffs of the New York Public Library and the Libraries of Columbia University, Yale University, and the University of Kansas and also to the staffs of the Library of Congress and the Libraries of Harvard, Princeton, Rutgers, California (Berkeley), Wisconsin, Chicago, and Oklahoma.

The University of Kansas has been generous with research grants which have permitted completion of this study. I am most grateful to the Committee for the Promotion of Advanced Slavic Cultural Studies, Inc., for a subsidy which made its publication possible.

Finally, I wish to express my indebtedness to the staff of the University of Kansas Press. The oft unsung type-setter deserves special thanks—in this case, Ralph Ciochon.

—O. P. B.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
I Introduction	1
II Geography and Offices	7
III Rights of the Nobility as Revealed in Land Grants	16
IV Rights of the Nobility as Revealed in Privileges	34
V Local Officeholders	49
Table	61
VI The Position of the Orthodox Church	79
VII Motives for the Desertion of Individual Nobles	94
VIII Conclusions	107
NOTES	111
APPENDIX I: Cartographic Methodology	133
APPENDIX II: Local Officeholders	135
WORKS CONSULTED:	
Abbreviations	155
Sources	158
Bibliographies	160
Secondary Accounts	160
GLOSSARY	164
INDEX	167
MAPS	in pocket

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is a first step in an attempt to ascertain the impact of minority peoples upon Russian institutions and ideas. It is centered on peoples who lived within the boundaries of the Lithuanian-Russian state during the period 1377-1514. It will be followed by a work dealing with the impact of those peoples, or West Russians as they are often termed,¹ upon Muscovite institutions and ideas.

Many historians have taken part in a long-continued search for the influences which have shaped Russian ideas and institutions, and which, consequently, have been of major importance in directing the course of Russian history. They have stressed four major influences: (1) the West—both in the days of the founding of the Russian state by the Varangians and since the time of Peter the Great, (2) the Slavs, (3) Byzantium, and (4) the Mongols. Most historians have been aware of all four, although individual historians have emphasized one or another of these forces.

The first influence—that of the West—was emphasized in the eighteenth century, when there was a tendency to consider Russian history as simply the history of dynasties, beginning with that of Riurik. Such an emphasis was quite natural in the age of absolutism, when dynasties appeared to be the decisive force in government. It led to considerable stress upon the Varangian or Scandinavian influence on Russia. The dynasty of Riurik was Scandinavian in origin, and the leaders of Russian life in the late ninth and early tenth centuries were Scandinavian princes and warrior-merchants.

The great eighteenth-century Russian historian, Vasilii N. Tatishchev, sought evidence of the influence of the Finns and of the Slavs.² The influence of the Slavs was further delineated at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the work of the father of modern Russian history, Nikolai M. Karamzin.³ He stressed the development of a single political entity in Russia. His emphasis was not on the people but on their state. Because of his belief in the importance of a strong centralized monarchy as a source of Russian strength, he established himself as a patriot and a monarchist.

Byzantium received its emphasis in the generation following Karamzin. Mikhail P. Pogodin, for example, stressed the influence of Byzantium or of Byzantine Christianity upon Russia.⁴ About the middle of the nineteenth century, because of the insistence of the Slavophiles that all Slavonic institutions and the Byzantine Church were far superior to anything Western, an old controversy became important. It is generally called the Normanist controversy. The heart of the dispute was whether or not the Varangians had been important to Russia. Often technical, often influenced by factors far removed from the subject under discussion, the controversy heralded a never-ending search for the forces which have molded Russia.

The fourth major influence, that of the Mongols, has generally been regarded as either disastrous or of little importance. A late nineteenth-century authority, Vasilii O. Kliuchevsky, interested in the role of the Russian people, especially of the Russian peasants, in Russian history, was among the significant historians who have viewed Mongol domination as a pure misfortune.⁵ In more recent times authors have disavowed this view of the Mongols by implicitly rejecting the concept of the development of serfdom as a result of Mongol fiscal demands,⁶ by seeking to evaluate the specific social and cultural contributions of the Mongols,⁷

or by emphasizing the direct and indirect influences of the Mongols on Russian political and cultural development.⁸

The selection of forces to be emphasized may result from different underlying concepts, consciously or unconsciously maintained by the various authors, as to what constitutes Russia. Russia may be defined as no more than that part of the Soviet Union known as European Russia. Or, as George Vernadsky has pointed out, Russia may be defined as that part of the Eurasian land mass now occupied by the Soviet Union.⁹ In view of the fact that the stability of the Russian state has depended upon control of that land mass, and in view of the long period of time during which Russia occupied much of that area, such a definition seems sensible. Any attempt to limit Russian history to an analysis of the development of European Russia is no more reasonable than an attempt to consider American history as the history of the development of the thirteen original colonies and their territories. If this larger definition of Russia is accepted, immediately many other areas and other peoples become worthy of examination as possible factors in the formation of Russian ideas and institutions. A fifth possible major influence emerges.

That fifth influence might be defined as the influence of minority peoples, that is (1) of non-Russians, other than those mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, and (2) of those Russians who did not share the experience of Mongol domination—that is, the West Russians who were subject to Lithuanian and Polish influences. These peoples range from the nomads of prehistory to the Tadzhiks of the twentieth century. Much has been done to increase our knowledge of earlier peoples, particularly those nomadic peoples who have left their mark on Russia.¹⁰ So far there has been relatively little analysis of the impress or lack of impress by those people who have become part of Russia in subsequent periods. There is much work to be done in attempting to discover what influence the Chinese, the tribes of Siberia, many Turkish tribes, the Persians, and others have had on the later development of Russian institutions and ideas. Even the peoples of Eastern Europe have not been thoroughly analyzed with a view to determining whether they have had other than political influence upon Russian development. Even if their influence should prove to have been negligible, the fact would be of importance, for it would tend to reaffirm existing analyses of the development of Russian ideas and institutions. The proof of substantial influence might force a reanalysis of the development of Russian ideas and institutions. The East European peoples under consideration comprise the inhabitants of the western part of present-day Great Russia, of the greater part of present-day Ukraine, and of Byelo-Russia—peoples who all once lived under the rule of the Great Princes of Lithuania.

Even before the year 1377, the beginning of the period treated in this study, some people living under Lithuanian rule seem to have deserted Lithuania for Moscow. Evidence about those people is so scanty as to be of little help except in tracing the genealogy of important Russian families; consequently, the effect of their desertions is difficult to measure.

From 1377 on, however, Russian nobles in increasing numbers began to exchange the rule of Lithuania for that of Moscow. At first but a few took the step of entering Muscovite service, and those few did not exert any great influence on the relative power positions of the Great Princes of Lithuania and of Moscow; toward the end of the fifteenth century, however, increasing numbers switched their allegiance and attached their lands to those of Muscovy.

Although the rise of Muscovite Russia had its origins in the Mongol period and was in the process of development in the fourteenth century, that rise became most spectacular during the second half of the fifteenth century and during the early years of the sixteenth century. The establishment of a Muscovite satellite, the Tsardom of Kasimov, in 1452, the subordination of Novgorod in 1478, and the conquest of Tver in 1485 are some of the steps by which the principality of Moscow established itself as one of the most powerful states in Eastern Europe. Moscow was assisted in its rise to power by the breakup of the Golden Horde and by dissension among the various Tatar Khanates.

Moscow was also aided by developments which adversely affected the position of Lithuania. The defeat of the Teutonic Order in 1410 at the first battle of Tannenberg (or at the battle of Grünwald, as it is sometimes called) left Lithuania free for the time being to expand and to consolidate her control over lands in the east. Part of Lithuania's strength was dependent upon the Lithuanian-Polish co-operation. That co-operation tended to be reduced during the second half of the fifteenth century because of Poland's involvement in the affairs of the West. Lithuania was thereby weakened. The rise of Moscow and the weakening of Lithuania coincided. Aside from Tatar lands, many of which were not culturally or economically valuable to Muscovite-Russians at this time, Pskov, Riazan, Lithuania, and one-half of the principality of Rostov represented the only areas into which Muscovite Russia could expand after 1485. Because agreements and family connections precluded attacks on Rostov and Riazan, and because the balance of power between Moscow and Lithuania and the nearness of Lithuania to Pskov made a Muscovite attack on Pskov hazardous, Lithuania represented the focal area of Muscovite expansion. The conquest of Lithuania would have represented the complete triumph of Moscow. Needless to say, the decision of Lithuanian-Russian nobles to exchange Lithuanian rule for Muscovite rule was of great help to Moscow.

The terminal dates of this study have been selected because they mark an interval during which the desertions most significant to the rise of Moscow took place. To be sure there were isolated desertions prior to 1377, such as that of Prince Dmitri Koriatovich Bobrok-Volynsky. On the death in 1377, however, of Olgerd, Great Prince of Lithuania, there were resulting internal disorders which helped to produce several important desertions to Moscow. In 1514 Moscow captured Smolensk. Thereafter Moscow made no significant westward advances for over a century and a third.

It is interesting to speculate what may have motivated nobles to take up the Muscovite cause. Sergei M. Soloviov, in his monumental history of Russia, did not attempt any direct speculation but tried to let the documents speak for themselves. He was particularly interested in the rise of the Russian state, and tried to present the steps by which that rise was accomplished. His presentation stresses the constant harassments of nobles on both sides of the border, but such harassments seemed to be linked with the tendency of Lithuania and Poland to follow a policy hostile to Russia and produced the decision of border nobles to support Moscow—in the mind of Soloviov an important factor in the rise of Moscow. He also mentions that some of the nobles who were almost exclusively Orthodox were probably induced to desert Lithuania for Moscow because of pressure exerted upon them to join the Catholic Church.¹¹

A Polish contemporary of Soloviov, Joachim Lelewel, laid most stress upon the attitudes of the nobles: "All the nobles, Lithuanian or Russian, Orthodox or

Catholic, eager for liberties . . . tired of their servitude, unwilling to suffer anyone above them in the commonwealth . . . did not desire a sincere union with Poland. . . ."¹² Thus Lelewel emphasized the political motive above all.

Subsequent historians have tended to stress other motives. Matvei K. Liubavsky, a student of Kliuchevsky and a professor at the University of Moscow, showed the importance of a political struggle within Lithuania. However, his works make it clear that the political struggle was primarily one between the Lithuanian Russians who were in control of the government and the Lithuanian Russians who did not enjoy that same favored position.¹³ In his analysis of the position of West Russian boyars, he confined himself mainly to an exposition (1) of the expansion of the control of the central government over local areas—a development which tended to restrict the power of the upper group of the Russian nobility (i.e., the former *udel'nye* and regional princes)—and (2) of the supremacy of the Catholic-Lithuanian pans in the council of the central government of the Lithuanian-Russian state in the fifteenth century. He did not establish a clear causal relationship between those conclusions and the eventual transfer of eastern Lithuanian lands to Moscow. In discussing the actual transfer of these lands Liubavsky described the religious problems which became important after the middle of the fifteenth century. Viewing as most significant the plot against Casimir by three Russian nobles in 1481, he emphasized that Casimir's successor as Great Prince of Lithuania, Alexander, later wrote that the plot was essentially religious in nature. Liubavsky states: "The departure of Bel'sky [one of the conspirators] was like a signal for the desertion of Lithuania by other border princes."¹⁴

Going beyond Liubavsky's position, his contemporary Aleksandr Presniakov found that the concept of a Russian nation, previously merely a traditional concept, became a working reality up through the fifteenth century, in part as a result of a growing concern with the position of Orthodoxy as opposed to Catholicism.¹⁵

Mikhailo S. Hrushevsky, a Ukrainian scholar, shared many of the views of Liubavsky; however, his point of departure was somewhat different, for he was interested in establishing the history of the Ukraine as the history of a distinct area. Therefore, he was much more interested in emphasizing conflict between Lithuania and the people of the Ukraine than in emphasizing the decision of some of these people to join Moscow. Quite naturally, therefore, he would have been inclined to reject any assumption of the development of a Russian national idea during the fifteenth century. Even more than Liubavsky, he was inclined to stress the religious motive.¹⁶

This emphasis is toned down in the work of the late Polish scholar, Fryderyk Papee, who was more interested in the development of institutions in Lithuania insofar as they reflected Polish influence.¹⁷

Stefan M. Kuczynski suggests that religious pressure was practically nonexistent in the fifteenth century and that contemporary complaints about it were no more than rationalizations for Muscovite conquest.¹⁸ Kuczynski's view is an example of the tendency to lay little stress upon the religious factor. In his exhaustive analysis of available information, Kuczynski presents many important corrections of previous statements, especially by stressing the expansion of the privileges and rights of the lower nobility of the Chernigov-Seversk lands.¹⁹

The medieval Polish historian, Ian Długosz, emphasized the importance of Muscovite attacks upon Lithuania as the reason for the loss of eastern lands,²⁰ a view which has been increasingly emphasized in recent times. Oscar Halecki has

suggested that the major cause for the loss of these lands and, by implication, for the desertion of Lithuania by West Russian nobles was Muscovite imperialism. Those events lessened the area within the Jagellonian confederation, which in his opinion was one of the great political structures of medieval Europe because it sought to bind together many lands but allowed each to maintain a degree of local autonomy.

It is evident from the foregoing that many explanations for the decision of the West Russian boyars to desert Lithuania have been suggested. Outstanding among them are Catholic pressure upon the Orthodox population of Lithuania, a political struggle between the Lithuanian and Russian populations of the Lithuanian-Russian state, and the warring of Muscovite Russia. This study will not only examine those suggestions but will also attempt to discover whether there are any other bases for the decision of the West Russian nobles.

It might be objected that preoccupation with the motivation of the nobility is an inadequate method for determining the reason for the decision of West Russians to join Moscow. Does not a study limited to an analysis of the nobility tend to equate the people of West Russia with the nobility of West Russia, and hence equate our understanding of the development of Russian ideas and institutions with the ideas and institutions to which the Russian nobility contributed? It does; however, the practical consequences of that methodological limitation are minor, for the nobility of West Russia in the fifteenth century formed most of that active 10 per cent which, as Arnold Toynbee has suggested, comprises the creative and dominant factor determining changes in social patterns.

There is a risk in treating the nobility as if it were a homogeneous unit. Certainly there were considerable differences in the way the nobles of Vitebsk and those of Volynia lived. To be sure, the availability of documents is not such as to encourage any attempt to analyze differences between the conditions under which the nobles of the different areas of eastern Lithuania lived. However, wherever possible, distinctions will be made between practices and motivations in different areas.

It may be suggested, of course, that existing data are inadequate for an analysis of even the nobility. The data are sparse and have to be put together like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle; at least they make a picture, however imperfect.

In order to show the motives of the nobility, this study will seek first to analyze the land-tenure system in Lithuania between 1377 and 1514, with particular attention to those areas conquered by Ivan III and Vasili III of Moscow. Moreover, it will compare the conditions of land-tenure existing among the Russian population of the Lithuanian-Russian state and those existing among its Lithuanian population. Analysis will be limited to the holdings of the nobility of those two areas. Such an analysis has not been made heretofore.

The analysis will be followed by a discussion of the privileges granted to the Lithuanian-Russian nobility from 1387 to 1506. Those privileges have formed a basis of Liubavsky's analysis; they reveal the handicap under which the Russian nobility of Lithuania was obliged to function and are subject to a slightly different interpretation when compared with the land grants.

The conclusions of Liubavsky as to positions in the government and army of the Lithuanian-Russian state and their duties are accepted in this study, which will analyze the personnel who held those positions, in an effort to determine whether or not the Russians had equal opportunity with Lithuanians in obtaining posts, and whether or not the officials were drawn mainly from the local populations in

the areas in which they served or from the population of some other area. Substantiation of the latter possibility would tend to support the view that there was a constant process of centralization which worked to the disadvantage of the Russian nobility. No attempt will be made to analyze the personnel holding posts in the central government of Lithuania, for that task has already been done by Liubavsky.

Furthermore, this study will analyze the religious question separately in an effort to determine the attitude of the Catholic Church in the struggle with the Orthodox Church for dominance within the Lithuanian-Russian state and to determine the impact of that attitude upon the nobles who decided to desert Lithuania for Moscow.

Lastly the coming to Moscow of nobles will be scrutinized individual by individual, in an attempt to discover positions held under the Lithuanian and Muscovite Great Princes, land-tenure rights enjoyed, cultural pressures, military developments at the local and regional levels, economic pressures, and the actual relative power of Lithuania and Moscow in a given locality—all as they might affect the decisions of individuals to join Moscow.

This study will not attempt to analyze the possible effects of trade or of changes in social customs upon such decisions, because sufficient data for such analyses are not available.

In a word the purpose of this study is to reveal more clearly the reasons for the shift of West Russian nobles from Lithuanian service to Muscovite service, and thereby to show some reasons for the increased power of the Muscovite state. This study is meant to pave the way for an appraisal of the influence of the West Russian boyars upon the development of Russian ideas and Russian institutions.

II. GEOGRAPHY AND OFFICES

To understand the principal problem of this work—namely, the delineation of the motives of the West Russian nobility or boyars in deserting Lithuania for Moscow between 1377 and 1514—one should have some understanding of the geography and political organization of the Lithuanian-Russian state of that time. A systematic geographical and political study based upon population, geologic structure, climate, topography, soils or economy might contribute to an understanding of geography and political organization; however, this chapter includes only essential background information—general remarks about the physical geography of the Lithuanian-Russian state and a sketch of the political areas.¹

In the fifteenth century Lithuania was roughly that land which lay between Poland and the Russian principalities subordinate to the Golden Horde at Sarai. Although pagan Lithuania had originally consisted only of Samogitia and Lithuania proper, during the greater part of the period treated in this study the northern, western, and southern boundaries, all of them fairly stable, embraced a much larger territory, a land generally inhabited by Russians, Byelo-Russians, and Ukrainians. Lithuania at its greatest extent in the last years of Vitovt (1426-30) extended from the Baltic Sea at Polangen in the northwest to the Black Sea in the vicinity of present-day Odessa in the southeast, and from the Dniestr River and the Polish frontier in the southwest to the Ugra River, close to Moscow, in the northeast. Four sections of the boundary fluctuated. The northwest boundary changed when the Teutonic Order conquered Samogitia in 1401; it was, however, essentially restored by Lithuanian conquests through 1426. In the thirties Lithuania lost Podolia, in the southwest, to Poland. In the southeast the frontier, less clearly defined because largely unsettled, changed from time to time as a result of Tatar incursions. The frontier toward Moscow, that in the northeast between the Oka River and 55°55' N., 31°0' E., fluctuated throughout the years 1377-1514.

In the thirteenth century, Lithuania had been ruled by a single great prince. In the fourteenth century the realities of foreign affairs had compelled a practical modification. When the Teutonic Order of Prussia became particularly powerful and aggressive, a Lithuanian leader with the authority and the ability to raise armies and repel invasions from the West was needed. During the reign of Olgerd, which ended in 1377, Olgerd's brother Keistut helped to keep the Germans at bay with such exceptional energy that he was indispensable to Olgerd. Keistut controlled lands centered on Troki, while Olgerd controlled the rest of the lands of Lithuania, centered around Vilna. Out of this arrangement the first provincial divisions emerged.²

As a result of the further division of lands among Olgerd's sons, the original Lithuanian lands and some adjacent Russian lands under Lithuanian control had by the year 1377 already been divided into four principalities: Vilna, Troki, Gorodno, and Novgorod (Litovsk). Russian lands centered on Novgorod (Litovsk) were referred to as Black Russia³ in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.

Other Russian lands were parts of the Lithuanian-Russian state during the period under consideration. The nearest to Lithuania proper was the land which included Kobrin, Slutsk, Turov, Gorodno, and Pinsk. Polotsk, Vitebsk, and Smolensk were principalities to the northeast, which were joined to Lithuania either just prior to 1377 or by 1404. Smolensk included two subordinate autonomous principalities, Viazma and Toropets, and one newly created principality,

Bel'sk. To the south was Kiev. West of Kiev was Volynia. East and north of Kiev was Chernigov-Seversk, a loosely knit area containing among others the principalities of Starodub, Novgorod-Seversk, Chernigov, Gomel, Mstislavl, and Briansk and its subordinate principality, Trubchevsk. Near Moscow were lands held by descendants of Prince Mikhail Chernigovsky—namely, the Novosilskys, Odoevskys, Vorotynskys, and Peremyshl'skys. In addition there were lands connected with the names of Belevsky, Karachevsky, Mosalsky, Khotetovsky, Kozel'sky, Pronsky, and Mezetsky. To the west along the Polish frontier and south of Volynia was Podolia, which remained a separate unit never reunited with Volynia, to which it had earlier been joined. During the period 1452-70 Podolia was divided, the eastern part being under the Kievan princes, and the western part under Poland.

This entire area shares common physical features. It lies in the great plain that stretches from Amsterdam to Peking. The Pripet Marsh, in which were located the principalities of Pinsk and Turov, interrupts that plain. The land is generally heavily wooded, being part of the mixed-forest region dominating northern Russia. Only in the south, especially in Podolia and parts of Kiev, do the forests give way to the steppes and their grasses.

Although the rivers and streams, with which the region is exceptionally well endowed, are not all useful as means of transportation, they do form a considerable water supply and are sources of fish and of beaver skins. The soil, which varies from gray to black, permits the growing of grains except in those areas oversupplied with water. Surface iron deposits, particularly in the form of bog iron, seem to have been numerous.

The peoples are generally Russian and Orthodox. This is substantiated by the fact that the Roman Catholic Church had but one ecclesiastical province in the region, the province of Gorodno, which included only Podliash'e (a part of the Brest land), Lithuania proper, and Samogitia. The rest of the land was under either the Metropolitan of Kiev or the Metropolitan of Moscow.

In addition to showing political areas, this chapter has the purpose of delineating the political organization of the Lithuanian-Russian state.⁴ The executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government were combined in the person of the ruler, the great prince, whose power was limited by local custom and by the influence of his council, or *rada*, which was composed of nobles, generally of Lithuanian origin. The powers of the council grew as the great prince came increasingly to depend upon it in his efforts to extend and to consolidate his sway over Russian lands and to fulfill the duties of the post to which many successive Lithuanian great princes were elected, the kingship of Poland. Not until the end of the fifteenth century did the council possess more than informal control over the policy of the Lithuanian government. The power of the great prince was also limited by the Lithuanian nobility, who elected the great prince to office and who during the fifteenth century came together with increasing frequency as an informal parliamentary body to consider major state problems, particularly those resulting from the personal union with Poland. Russian nobles began to play a minor role in the institutions of the central government in 1430, but control of the institutions remained in the hands of Catholic Lithuanians throughout the period of this study.

The power of the great prince was exercised either by himself or by his agents. The great prince sat in the major capital, Vilna, or in some of the other cities in which he had castles, especially in Troki or Lutsk. Although the agents of the

great prince at the central governmental level had once been household servants, the growth of the Lithuanian-Russian state gave them increased importance and made their functions of far greater consequence, so that they became state officials. The positions were to an increasing extent held by Catholic nobles of Lithuanian birth.

The dominance of Catholic Lithuanian nobles in the central government, especially as members of the *rada* or as state officials, provides a possible motive for the desertion of West Russians to Moscow. In the early fifteenth century, when the role of the nobility in the government was modest and when the outlying Russian areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state exercised a high degree of control over their own affairs, Orthodox Russian nobles probably were little affected by the dominance of Catholic Lithuanians in the central government. Later, in the fifteenth and in the early sixteenth century, when the outlying Russian areas were subjected to a greater degree of control by the central government and when the role of the nobility in the government was more significant, Orthodox Russian nobles may have resented the dominance of Catholic Lithuanian nobles in the central government—a dominance conclusively demonstrated by Liubavsky.⁵ It will be sufficient here to consider the problem only in connection with office-holding on the local level.

Agents of the great prince also functioned at the local level. They are important to this study because their activities directly affected the West Russian nobles from whose ranks came those who deserted to Moscow. The agents were numerous and were organized in a governmental hierarchy.

Knowledge of their posts and of the duties pertaining to them helps to make clear which posts an official might prefer to hold because they would bring him either greater power or greater revenues. In Chapter V offices and officeholders will be identified in an effort to determine area by area and period by period whether any particular groups enjoyed the more desirable posts and whether inequities in the distribution of offices might have influenced desertions to Moscow.

There were several positions in the governmental hierarchy.⁶ The earliest local posts were those of the *namestniki*, or prefects, and *tivuny*, or bailiffs. As Lithuania came into closer relationship with Poland, those prefects who controlled court and justice as agents of the great prince either in the capitals of old *udel'nye* or autonomous principalities or in large areas, adopted the name of *starosty*, or administrators. The prefects of Samogitia were the first to use the title, followed by the prefects of Lutsk and finally those of the Brest land and of the *okrugi*, or prefectures of Podliash'e and Kovno. By the time of the First Lithuanian Statute of 1529, prefects who had under them several prefectures controlled by subordinate prefects also were called administrators. In none of these cases did the change in title involve a change in function. Generally such a change was accompanied by the emergence of the new term, *derzhavtsa*, a substitute for the earlier *namestnik*. In view of the similarity of their functions both *namestniki* and *derzhavtsy* may be called prefects.

The chief prefects of the former principalities of Vilna, Troki, Kiev, Polotsk, Vitebsk, and Smolensk were called *voevody*, or governors-general, from the Polish office which represented chairmanships over the local nobility. The governors-general of Vilna and Troki were provincial military heads. At the same time they were chief prefects and head noblemen judges of the prefectures of Vilna and Troki (roughly equivalent to merely the old principalities of Vilna and Troki). The large regions of Vilna and Troki included not only those principalities but

also some old Russian lands: the prefectures of Brest and Podliash'e and Poles'e. In Kiev, Polotsk, and Vitebsk the concept of governor-general arose independently because the chief prefects assumed some of the power of the autonomous princes. The prefect of Smolensk, prior to his assumption of the title of governor-general, had a political and military district larger than his juridico-administrative province. The implications of the title of governor-general were attached to the title of administrator of Samogitia. In Volynia two officials existed: the holder of the land, who was marshal of the Volynia land, and his subordinate, who was the administrator of Lutsk. Podolia had only one official, the administrator, and Chernigov-Seversk was not organized but contained many former appanages (or *udeli*) which were not completely subordinated. There were governors-general of Novgorod, formerly prefects, and prefects, later administrators, of Brest, Gorodno, and Kovno, and governors-general of Podliash'e. The governors-general and administrators, as successors to the autonomous princes, exercised supreme judicial and administrative power in those prefectures which in the days of the autonomous principalities had been separate political entities. In smaller cities and in districts, administration and justice were handled by prefects, appointed by governors-general and administrators, and by prefects and bailiffs, appointed by the great prince from among local princes, pans, and boyars, to serve at his pleasure, for life or on an annual basis. Governmental units directly under governors, administrators, prefects, and bailiffs were called *poveti*, "districts" and *volosti*, "townships," the former term being borrowed from the Poles.

Certain differences can be discovered in the administration of the ten larger governmental regions. The first eight were single, unified jurisdictions; these will now be presented in the order of their size, which is significant because size tended to coincide with economic and political importance to the Lithuanian-Russian state. Generally the chief administrative-judicial offices of the larger regions represented greater power and greater economic advantage to the officeholder.

The *voevodstvo* (or governor-generalcy) of Vilna contained three administrative jurisdictions: (1) the judicial-administrative district of the governor-general of Vilna, including (a) the townships of the former principality of Vilna in the narrow sense, many of them under the control of princes, pans, and clerics, and (b) several Vitebsk townships; (2) the judicial-administrative district of the prefect, later governor, of Novgorod, including townships of the former principality of Novgorod; (3) the autonomous principalities of Slutsk, Kletsk, and Mstislavl', several townships of the last-named being directly under the control of the great prince.

The second *voevodstvo*, or province of Troki, also contained three administrative jurisdictions: (1) the judicial-administrative district of the governor of Troki, including the townships of the former principality of Troki in the narrow sense, many of these belonging to princes and pans; (2) the judicial-administrative district of the prefect, later administrator, of Kovno, Gorodno, Brest, Bel'sk, Drogi-chin, and Mel'nik (these divisions had no historical roots, being formed of townships under the control of princes and pans); (3) the principalities of Kobrin, Pinsk, Gorodets, and Turov.

The third largest province was that of Samogitia, all of which was under an administrator.

The fourth was the Volynia land, comprising the districts of Lutsk, Vladimir, and Kremenets, which had been formed by the autonomous princes of those districts, and comprising in greater measure the townships of lesser princes and pans.

The fifth was that of the governor-general of Kiev, comprising with the exception of Lithuanian Podolia all lands which had been under the Kievan princes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The sixth largest province was that of Smolensk, which contained three administrative jurisdictions: (1) at all times, the judicial-administrative district of the prefect, later governor-general, of Smolensk, including townships previously under the control of the last princes of Smolensk, many of which were handed over to the control of servitor-princes and pans; (2) up to 1503, the judicial-administrative district of Toropets, Briansk, Mtsensk, and Liubutsk, each of which in many respects might be regarded as a distinct entity; and (3) up to 1503, the principalities of Bel'sk and Viazma, and those of the greater Chernigov princes.

The seventh largest province was the undivided jurisdiction of the governor-general of Vitebsk, and comprised townships and areas controlled by the Vitebsk princes of the fourteenth century (with slight exceptions to the south and with the addition of the lands of the Drutsky princes, former allies of the princes of Vitebsk).

The eighth largest province was the undivided jurisdiction of the governor-general of Polotsk and comprised the townships and areas controlled by the Polotsk princes of the fourteenth century as well as lands of the Lukomsky princes, former allies of the princes of Polotsk.

The ninth largest region was that of Lithuanian Podolia, which was not a single, unified jurisdiction but contained the districts of Braslavl', Venitsa and Zvenigorod and at times the district of Kamenets.

A tenth region, Chernigov-Seversk, scarcely deserves its name, for it was little more than an agglomeration of lands over which the Lithuanian government never exercised more than nominal control, actual jurisdiction being in the hands of local autonomous princes. It also contained a few unattached townships or loose *volosti* in the hands of governmental appointees. To this region might be added the upper Oka lands over which the Lithuanian government often failed to exercise even nominal control.

The commonest type of regional and provincial administrative official was the prefect who fulfilled numerous functions. Among them was that of local economic agent of the great prince. He was in charge of crown lands which included all land not specifically controlled or exploited by some one else and all lands held directly by peasants. Crown lands were generally diminished by the tendency of great princes to give grants of land, with the obligation to perform military service, to noblemen and townspeople. Under each prefect there was at least one court or manor, to which were attached involuntary *cheliadi*, and great-princely *parobki* with slaves which comprised the total labor force directly subordinate to the great prince or his agents. Under the prefect there were peasants or "lord's people" who were *tiaglye*—that is, liable to be taxed or to be assessed. Their tax apparently consisted generally of work at the local court, or work in the fields, and of transportation services. They also paid a *diaklo*, a tribute in kind on all produce, and a *mezlava*, a tribute in kind on all livestock. The *diaklo* appears in documents dealing with lands only in Lithuania proper, Brest, the principalities of Pinsk and Kobrin, and Minsk.⁷ Some "lord's people" were keepers of wild beehives, beaver-trappers, sedge-men, brush burners, fishermen, falconers, swineherds, grooms, and caretakers of mares. Above the peasants, especially in economic privileges and legal rights, were servants (*slugi*) who sometimes enjoyed rights similar to those of boyars. They were often builders and repairers of roads

(*putnye liudi*). All of these categories of peasants and servants made up the so-called great princely townships. Peasants in these categories were called township people in contrast to the townspeople or burghers and the nobles who were distinct from them. In Polotsk even the burghers often performed services alongside peasants. Nobles' peasants often performed some sort of services for the great prince in spite of the fact that the privileges of 1387, 1413, and 1447⁸ freed princes, pans, boyars, and landed gentry from sending people to perform services for the great prince. "But under the sway in the Lithuanian-Russian state of the system of privileges, under the domination of regional definitions, of immunities, and of exceptions to general norms of law, results came slowly. . . . In the Volynia land up to the very year 1501 people of the church, of the princes, of the pans, and of the landed gentry went to work to the fortresses and courts of the ruler 'to plow and to harvest and to cut hay.'"⁹ All of the services rendered by people in the several categories mentioned above were under the control of the prefect, in his capacity as steward of the great prince's economic interests.

Apparently the prefects of the districts of Vilna and Troki were expected to make annual reports on income and revenue, but that practice does not seem to have become the norm in other districts. The actual work was often under the direction of the bailiffs, who might be termed "the immediate plenipotentiaries of the prefects."¹⁰ Other people shared the powers of the prefects and bailiffs.

The prefects supervised military service by the nobility and townspeople. "Every noble, *boiarin*, and *zemianin*, from a given piece of land, from which arises one boyar's-service, was obliged personally and at his own cost to go forth to war."¹¹ Sometimes a holding could involve the additional obligation to stand guard.

Prefects were also in charge of the great princely court system, but their jurisdiction did not extend over persons living on lands granted to a noble, a limitation which grew steadily during the fifteenth century. In Podliash'e the judicial power of the prefect was further limited by the right of the landed gentry to select the judge, the judicial fee-collector, and the clerk. Otherwise the judicial competence of the prefect was almost unlimited. Bailiffs, subordinate to them, were even allowed to try cases involving the great prince or a governor-general.

The material benefits of posts as prefects or bailiffs were numerous. They lived in residences with servitors who assisted in ruling. Among the servitor officials were sub-prefects who were not only under prefects but also under bailiffs. The prefects received various revenues for their services, including grants from the great prince. These advantages did not accrue merely as a result of their services as local administrators. In the event that an area contained no great-princely domains or in the event that the administrator was not in continuous residence, he generally received *korm*, or subsistence. Revenues which prefects and bailiffs received as the judicial-administrative official varied widely from place to place. Sometimes as a result of great-princely grants he received various taxes. Usually he retained a share of the total grand-princely revenues, all or the largest part of which he collected for the great prince.

The higher posts of governor-general and administrator generally involved more administrative duties; however, others exercised that power. Although the prefects, both the *namestniki* and *derzhavtsy*, were the common exercisers of governmental power, the administrator of Samogotia and the governor-general of Kiev were in many respects more nearly typical prefects. In Vitebsk, Polotsk, and Smolensk some of the townships were controlled by local nobles.

The governors and administrators collected tribute, commanded fortresses, generally organized and controlled local military forces, and acted as judges in several matters. They issued decrees and orders to local rulers, often relative to peasant lands and services. In all these activities they proceeded as representatives of the interest of the great prince with the aim of securing maximum revenues. Like prefects, they collected taxes and tribute. The collection of some taxes was granted as a privilege by the great prince, who was the source of any right to inn-keeping, holding sales, or collecting tolls.

The jurisdiction of the governors-general and administrators extended over the peasants and over the city people of the great prince, who did not enjoy the benefits of municipal self-government under Magdeburg Law, and over those princes, pans, boyars, and others who were military-service landholders. Generally their jurisdiction, like that of the prefects, did not extend over the peasants of the local nobility or over persons living in those cities under Magdeburg Law, but did cover all cases of robbery, riot, arson, and rape, and they adjudged complaints against subject nobles for failure to carry out the law. But, in Podliash'e the administrators of Bel'sk, Drogichin, and Mel'nik did not judge the landed gentry under their jurisdiction except for special offenses. In addition, the administrators of Podliash'e had to share judicial competence with the local nobility. Generally, the judicial function of governors-general and administrators was reduced by the partial transfer of their function to itinerant judges, sent by the great prince, to review cases on the spot, and by transfer to private arbitrators who undertook judicial examination of complaints. Thus many decisions were rendered by others than the governors-general and administrators.

Most governors-general and administrators depended upon servitors for assistance. They exercised greater control over those servitors than did prefects.

Generally governors-general and administrators did not receive subsistence from local inhabitants but depended rather upon a percentage of the income from the great prince's own lands which they generally administered under a bailiff. If, however, their right to rule resulted from a lien, then they received revenues from their area of rule. In the latter case they generally received their offices for life. In normal cases a governor-generalship or administratorship was granted for life or until the conferring of a more honorable and lucrative post.

The governing function of the governor-general or administrator was in part a legacy of the powers once enjoyed by rulers of the independent principalities which had been incorporated into Lithuania and in part a legacy of the activity of the agents of those formerly independent princes.

Geographically, the administration of the governor-general or administrator was less centrally organized than that of the prefect. There was no one local judicial-administrative center to which taxes and tributes might flow, although there were cases of governors-general and administrators, living in centrally located castles, who derived revenues from great-princely city folk and peasants in subordinate judicial-administrative districts. Generally great-princely peasants did not come to participate in affairs of a town, or of fortresses on the boundaries of the region in which they lived. There were great private estates in prefectures and although the estates were not part of them administratively, holders performed certain obligations. There were main cities in regions to which came contributions from the districts of great-princely prefects and from the great estates of private holders. Prefects of the principal cities of regions were converted into governors-general and administrators. They were the main stewards of the great

prince and collectors of his revenues from an area larger than that under their own immediate control. Their financial reward was sometimes very great, since they not only collected revenues from many townships but also spent revenues on their own and on local needs. There was a slight tendency for some townships to slip out of the control of the prefects of the principal cities of the regions.

Some offices pertained only to cities and not to *volosti* at all. For example, the lower courtiers (*okol'nichie*) of Smolensk were merely members of the judicial and administrative council ruling Smolensk with the prefect (later governor-general) of Smolensk. The *okol'nichie* obliged citizens to perform certain duties. More important obligations included specific labors and hospitality to envoys. The latter obligation was legally met by the payment of a tax.

Another official in Smolensk was the treasurer. He was in charge of the treasury and of the collection of fines for smuggling. That position existed also in Briansk, but neither it nor the post of *okol'nichii* was to be found in any other principal city in Lithuania. Some similar functionaries, called *gorodnichie*, had the tasks of supervising city work and collecting the *diakla* of the *volosti*.

Bridge supervisors functioned in the cities of Smolensk, Lutsk, Kremenets, and Polotsk. There were some cavalry masters in major cities who administered and judged the affairs of grooms in the larger great-princely courts of each region. Sub-cavalry masters were present in Vilna and Troki.

Those who held posts as bailiffs or judges—posts which had previously involved the administration of justice in the great-princely court in the principal cities—were generally put into the suburban courts to which nearby and distant townships were subordinated for the performance of obligations and the administration of justice.

In the main great-princely courts there were depositories for the honey tribute from the townships which had formerly belonged to autonomous princes but now were parts of the provinces of governors-general and administrators. Keepers of the keys controlled the honey-depositories. In Vilna and Troki and upper Dniepr townships, the honey tribute was brought by keepers of the keys to the keeper of the keys of Novgorod-Litovsk. There were also keepers of the keys of Brest, Kiev, Minsk, Kovno, and Lutsk. The *chasnitstvo* may have been another term for the post of keeper of the keys.¹² In Vilna and Troki there were even assistant keepers.

Sometimes in the main city of a region there were officials to collect tribute from vassals. These officials (*dannichie* and *lovchie*) are known to have functioned at least in Smolensk, Brest, Briansk, and Vitebsk.

There was a host of still less important officials, more properly servitors of the crown, in various parts of Lithuania. There were falconers in Novgorod-Litovsk and Vitebsk from the days when autonomous or independent princes ruled there. Falconers later appeared in the provinces of Krevo and Lida. There were beaver-trappers in Polotsk, Vitebsk, Lutsk, and the Podliash'e prefecture of Brest and probably in Samogitia and Kiev. Several administrators and especially the administrator of Gorodno, had servitors called foresters and thicketers. *Voznye* served writs in the regions of Brest-Podliash'e.

Limitations on the powers of governors-general and of administrators were imposed by custom and by the reservation of powers to the great prince. The power exercised by lesser officials represented a further limitation. Moreover, it must always be remembered that the jurisdiction of the administrators and governors as administrative and judicial officials far exceeded the area which they

controlled directly. Their judicial power was limited by the fact that governors-general did not always judge vassals of the great-prince who had never been under the control of individual princes. That limitation was present, for example, in the Slonim and Kamenets provinces of the governor-generalship of Troki and in the Braslavl', Minsk, and Mogiliv provinces of the *voevodstvo* of Vilna.

In courts and on the council, or *rada*, the governors-general or administrators were further limited by their dependence upon the local bishop, police officials, local servitor princes, older boyars and citizens, and—occasionally—just “good” people.

In spite of these limitations, the governor-general and administrators or their equivalents exercised a considerable degree of independence. The administrator of Lutsk acted more as the representative of the local princes of the old Volynia land; the prefect of Polotsk was treated as a prince in his own right by Germans who entered into diplomatic relations with him; the administrator of Samogitia tended to regard himself as prince of Samogitia and thus often opposed the great prince.

From the foregoing description it should be clear that there was a hierarchy of posts. The highest posts in that hierarchy were those of governor-general and administrator, closely followed by that of prefect. In some cases a specific post as prefect could entail greater power than a specific post as governor-general. Bailiffs followed prefects in importance. It should be noted that local prefects and bailiffs were less important than those sharing in the government of a sizable region. All the other offices might be considered equal in importance, though the importance of tax-collecting might indicate that the post of treasurer was the most desirable among the subordinate posts.

Since the search for power and for economic advantage and also for the resultant social prestige may be postulated as one of the basic drives of mankind, it seems reasonable to assume that those who held local offices would be more content than those who did not and that the extent to which the desire to hold office might be gratified in a given locality, might well determine the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the aspiring elements of the population of that locality with the government of Lithuania.

Who held these posts, then, becomes a significant question in determining the extent of local dissatisfaction with the central government.

III. RIGHTS OF THE NOBILITY AS REVEALED IN LAND GRANTS

In order to understand the conditions under which they lived and the motives of specific nobles in deserting Lithuania, it is necessary to examine the rights of the various nobles.

TYPES OF NOBLES

First of all, one must be familiar with the categories of nobles, who may be classified as autonomous princes, regional princes, feudal nobles, and agents of the Lithuanian government.¹

Autonomous princes who might be considered subordinate to the great princes of Lithuania were few in number. They were probably limited to princes living along the border who once fitted the category of *udel'nye* princes and who were looked upon by Moscow and Lithuania as desirable catches. A case in point is Feodor L'vovich Novosil'sky and Odoevsky. He signed a treaty with Casimir, February 20, 1442, when the latter was still only Great Prince of Lithuania.² That treaty had four major provisions: (1) Feodor promised to serve faithfully "without any trickery." (2) Casimir promised not to enter Feodor's lands. Then it was specifically stated that a quasi-treaty (*dok'on'chalnaia gramota*) was made by Casimir because of Feodor's desire not to have rights granted him. Such a specific reference to avoiding any grant of rights would argue a realization on Feodor's part that if he received a charter of confirmation of rights he would be placed in a category of nobles whose rights were dependent upon the great prince—a situation which he wished to avoid. (3) Feodor retained the right to render final judgment in all cases arising in his lands, thereby denying possible litigants the right of appeal to Casimir. Provision was made for the possibility that Feodor and Casimir might have to judge jointly. (4) Lastly, Feodor insisted upon the continuation of any joint court arrangement "as of old" with the princes of Moscow, Pereslavl', and Pronsk. Any case not decided by joint action of Feodor and the above princes was to be submitted to Casimir so that he might negotiate a settlement with these three princes.³

Regional princes were most common in the seventies and eighties of the fourteenth century. They were descendants of Great Prince Gedemin, and owed their control of regions within the Lithuanian-Russian state to the fact that they were members of the ruling family. They generally attempted to achieve autonomy. Such attempts were checked by the centralizing tendencies of the Great Princes of Lithuania. By the end of the reign of Vitovt, most of the regional princes had been reduced to the rank of feudal nobles. The princely family of Pinsk was the only family of regional princes to maintain its status through 1514. Characteristic of a regional prince was his right to make grants to other princes, to nobles in general, to citizens of cities, to peasants, to churchly individuals and to ecclesiastical organizations, in the manner of great princes.

A much more common category was that of feudal nobles, bearing the titles prince, pan, boyar, or its equivalents. They received specific land grants, either original or confirmatory grants. At first they were not mentioned as servants (*slugi*), although as early as 1383 Vitovt called Vasilii Karachevsky "our servant."⁴ That term became more and more nearly general; however, as late as 1424, the Prince of Chernigov, Svidrigailo, cousin to Vitovt, failed to speak of Iuri Kozeniat as his servant.⁵ Generally these nobles were granted specific rights in contrast to the regional princes for whom no rights were outlined.

Lastly there were agents of the great princes of Lithuania, individuals who received grants to certain areas, such as *namestniki*, prefects; *starosty* or *capitanei*, administrators; and *voevody*, governors-general. At first these individuals seem to be clearly distinguished from the feudal nobility by the insecurity of their tenure; however, as time passed, they tended to acquire the same rights as the feudal nobles.

TYPES OF LAND GRANTS

There were two principal types of land grants, those for a term and those of potentially infinite duration. The former are characterized by the phrase "at our will" or "for his life" or by similar words of limitation. Such grants rarely contained specific mention of the rights which went with the land. They were generally made to nobles of inferior rank.⁶ Since those for a term were less desirable, a detailed analysis of them will not help to explain the motives of the West Russian nobles in deserting Lithuania. Jealousy or dissatisfaction would be likely to arise over less desirable grants only if some nobles received such grants either in an unusually large quantity or of an unusually high quality or if some other nobles failed to receive any grants. Since evidence of such conditions has not been uncovered, greater attention will be directed to grants of potentially infinite duration which generally specified a substantial number of rights.

The rights granted may be divided into several categories: rights relating to economic exploitation, to ownership, to political control and to judicial control. For the sake of convenience the first category will be labeled economic rights, and the last three categories will be labeled political rights. It should be remembered, however, that economic and political rights tended to merge. Economic rights had political implications, and political rights had economic implications. It may be objected that rights of ownership are economic rights; however, the political implications of rights of ownership justify their classification as political rights.

Ownership is a recurrent theme in the land grants of West Russia, heralded by the words, "We grant him for his faithful service." Implicit is the assumption that the Great Prince of Lithuania had some sort of fundamental right of possession to the land which he might grant. Explicit is the statement that the recipient obtained the holding as a result of his service. Service performed was the condition of receiving land. The importance of the phrase may be gleaned from a grant of Casimir of either 1456 or 1471.⁷ That grant was the fulfillment of a petition of a *dvorianin*, Bogdan Volchkovich, that he be allowed rule of Priveredovo on the grounds "that he had earned through service to that inhabitant of heaven, Princess Svidrigailova [i.e., the deceased widow of Svidrigailo], an estate by the name of Priveredovo . . . and he showed us that for centuries that estate has been that of a boyar and not taxable [*tiagloe*]." Bogdan asserted his claim to the estate by referring to his service; however, not only his service but also the status of the land was essential. It had been boyar or noble land for centuries; therefore Princess Svidrigailova had granted him land which it was proper to grant. Had it been taxable, Bogdan would have been counted as one of the *tiaglye liudi*, the peasants upon whom imposts could be laid.⁸

In almost every land grant with specified rights appeared the words, "We grant to him, his wife, his children, and subsequent descendants eternally." That statement seems to be in conflict with the assertion of M. K. Liubavsky, who stated: ". . . the Great Prince of Lithuania had the right to grant and take back."⁹

Liubavsky supported his argument by referring to the case of Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky, from whom Casimir took Briansk, which he had granted him, and to whom he gave instead Starodub and Gomel'.¹⁰ But Liubavsky tempered his suggestion with the statement that the right of a great prince to take away land previously granted was limited by the Privilege of 1434 of Sigismund Keistutovich. Even in charters before 1434 there are references to children and future possible descendants.¹¹ Liubavsky's view is supported, however, by the loss of estates suffered by regional princes, by members of the ruling princely family of Lithuania,¹² and by those who deserted Lithuania for Moscow.¹³ The tempo of confiscations seems to have increased in the later part of the fifteenth century as the number of those fleeing to Moscow rose sharply.¹⁴

Of the four groups of nobles—autonomous princes, regional princes, feudal nobles, and agents of the Lithuanian government—the latter two groups received almost all of the grants with specified rights; the former two received such grants generally as part of the process of their incorporation into the feudal nobility of the Lithuanian-Russian state. The rights were of an economic and of a political nature.

Before analyzing rights, one may well indicate the chronological groupings in which the land grants will be considered. The first involves documents up to 1430, that is, of the era of Lithuanian expansion; the second, documents of 1430-52, the era when Svidrigailo played an important role, either as Great Prince of Lithuania or as autonomous prince of areas in the Southwest; the third, documents of the reign of Casimir, 1440-92; and the fourth, documents from 1492-1514, the era of Casimir's sons and of war with Muscovy. A few documents dated later than 1514 will be discussed. It has seemed wiser not to consider all documents from the years 1440 to 1452 together, for Svidrigailo as representative of an anti-Polish and, to some extent, pro-Orthodox tendency might be expected to have made grants of a somewhat different nature than Casimir. A clearer estimate of the policies of Svidrigailo and of Casimir should emerge from separate treatment of their grants.

ECONOMIC RIGHTS

An analysis of the specific rights of economic exploitation reveals that the nobles received very few rights. The earliest available grant is of Casimir the Great, dated 1361. The rights mentioned are to hay, rivers, runs, thickets, oak groves, timber woods, wild hives, honeybees, marshes, tools, and catches. These rights appear in almost all the subsequent grants of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries which also include the right of inheritance.¹⁵

In the period up to 1430, the year of the death of Vitovt, whenever specific rights were mentioned, only the following were almost always mentioned: hay, oak trees, and timber forests.¹⁶

If all the rights granted up to 1430 are grouped according to the type of economic activity involved, there emerge the following categories: (1) water rights—to rivers, oxbows, marshes, ponds and little ponds, sources, wells and waters in general; (2) hunting and fishing rights—to mills and to their products; (3) hunting and fishing rights—to catches and little catches, to beaver and their dwellings, to wild game and to game and bird bag; (4) land rights—to hills and hummocks, to hay, to fields, to pasturage, to meadows, to fallow lands, to ploughed land, and bee land; (5) forest rights—to timber forests, to oak trees, to oak groves, to thickets and to birch groves; (6) honey rights—to bees, to wild

hives, to hives and to bee land;¹⁷ (7) subsoil rights—to ores; (8) labor rights—to inhabitants; and (9) revenue rights—to all taxes, to tributes, tolls, and payments. Categories 4 and 5 appear in all grants; categories 1, 3, and 6, in many grants; categories 2, 8, and 9, infrequently; and category 7 only once. Clearly, the exploitation of lands and forests was the basic purpose of these grants.

It is necessary to seek some explanation for the failure of all rights to appear in all documents. Of course, the nature of the specific area to be granted might have been the determining factor. For example, land which boasted no beehives could not be granted with honey rights. Perhaps, however, the most satisfactory way to seek an explanation would be to examine the recipients of the grants and the geographic areas in which they were located.

The recipients were generally not princes; but if they were princes, that title was never used and the names are not recognizable as princely, with the exception of Vasilii Karachevsky.¹⁸ That specific rights of economic exploitation were not granted to princes during this period can be explained on the grounds that many princes already had those rights inherently, and that Vitovt, in his efforts at centralization, was pursuing an anti-princely policy.

Documents dealing with the general area of Chernigov-Seversk,¹⁹ the easternmost part of the Great-principality of Lithuania, contain fewer specific rights than those from other regions.²⁰ The longest lists of rights come from the *povet* of Lutsk in the west.²¹ It must be admitted that the lists are in documents which are the last chronologically.

It is interesting to note that only in one or more of those grants referring to lands in the *povet* of Lutsk do many of the rights occur: to all revenues, tribute, ploughed land, bee-lands, catches, beaver runs, beaver dwellings, little ponds, ores, all payments, lakes, and wells. Rights to runs, tolls, little catches, and mills appear in only one other grant besides the Lutsk grants. Since Poles enjoyed many more rights than Lithuanians early in the fifteenth century, the nobles of Lutsk may have profited from the proximity of Poland.

An examination of the grants of the period 1430-52 by Svidrigailo, Great Prince of Lithuania, 1430-32, competitor with Sigismund Keistutovich for the great-princely throne, 1432-38, and self-styled Great Prince of Lithuania thereafter, until his death in 1452, reveals an increase in the number of rights granted.²² Except for rights to bird bag, oak groves, birch groves and tolls, all the rights granted prior to 1430 appear in grants during the period 1430-52. Many other rights are mentioned for the first time. To category (1), water rights, are added rights to streams, channels, shores, and little shores; to (2), milling rights, to little mills; to (3), hunting and fishing rights, to beaver catches, fish; to (4), land rights, to weeds; to (5), forest rights, to pine groves, twigs, and thickets; to (7), subsoil rights, to ore forests; to (8), labor rights, to service and *tiaglo*; and to (9), revenue rights, to *grosh* payments, rents, and gifts.

With the exception of one charter, which mentions only *tiaglo*,²³ a few rights appear in all grants. A few others appear in all but two or three grants. They are to hay, rivers, wells, runs, timber forest, catches and little catches, and ponds. That group is much more extensive than the group of rights consistently granted in the period up to 1430. Instead of being limited to land and land products, it lays much greater stress upon water rights and includes hunting and fishing rights.

An examination of the nine groups, excluding the one grant mentioned above, reveals which rights were important. Water and hunting and fishing and land

rights appear in all grants. Forest and revenue rights are lacking in only one grant; honey and labor rights, in two; milling rights, in three; and subsoil rights, in four.

Again looking at the titles of those to whom the grants were made, we discover that almost everyone is referred to as pan or pany, with the exception of Peter Mushchich, who is called master cook and then pan, and Mikhail Vasilievich Czartoryski, who is called prince.²⁴ The grants to the latter contain references to all categories of rights. Since the number of rights granted varies and since most of the grantees were pans, the position of the recipient within the hierarchy does not seem to have determined the numbers of rights granted, although it probably affected the possibility of his receiving any rights.

Looking at the grants from a geographic point of view we find that most of them were to lands in areas nearer to Poland. Some of the grants with many rights²⁵ and the single grant with few rights²⁶ refer to lands located in the *povet* of Lutsk. Other grants with many rights refer to lands in the Kremenets *povet*²⁷ and in Zhitomir.²⁸ Those with fewer rights refer to lands more distant from Poland.

It must be borne in mind that all of these grants were made by Svidrigailo. That fact might outweigh geographical considerations. Svidrigailo was suffered to regain the rule of some of the lands of which he had been ruler when he was the pro-Orthodox Great Prince of Lithuania, in spite of the fact that his cousin Sigismund Keistutovich had supplanted him as reigning Great Prince. It seems probable that Svidrigailo, in an effort to secure the faithful support of the nobles of his lands in Southwest Russia or in Southeast Lithuania, conceded many rights, vainly hoping that such moves might regain him the throne of Lithuania, the title to which he still used.

With the exception of milling rights the same categories of rights to economic exploitation appear in land grants issued during the reign of Casimir, 1440-92. Some of these documents dated 1450 overlap chronologically with those issued by Svidrigailo. There are only eight grants available with lists of specific economic rights. Few specific rights were mentioned in the grants. No right was mentioned in every document.²⁹

Most of the same rights appear which were in grants made by Vitovt and Svidrigailo; however, from each category, many do not appear. They are (1) water rights—to oxbows, sources, streams, channels, shores, and to-the-shores; (2) milling rights—to mills and little mills, and their products; (3) hunting and fishing rights—to bird bag and fish; (4) land rights—to weeds, hills, hummocks, and pasturage; (5) forest rights—to pine groves, birch groves, and twigs; (7) subsoil rights—to ore forests; (9) revenue rights—to grosh payments and rents. Two new rights appear: (1) water rights—to lakes; (3) hunting and fishing rights—to beaver runs.

The recipients of the grants are either given no title or termed pan or prince. There seems to be no relationship between the title and the nature of the grant.

Who were the recipients of the grants? They were Nemir Rezanovich,³⁰ Semashko Epifanovich,³¹ Prince Mikhail Kostiantinovich,³² Volchko Zhiaskovsky,³³ *Boiarin* Demid,³⁴ and Pan Olizar Shilovich.³⁵

Four of those who received grants were officials of the Lithuanian government.³⁶ Nemir Rezanovich, normally termed pan, was *starosta* of Lutsk and a member of the great prince's council at least from 1446 to 1551. Semashko Epifanovich was called pan and was a member of the council of Svidrigailo in 1445,³⁷

and possibly until the latter's death in 1452.³⁸ Prince Mikhail Kostiantinovich Ol'shanitsky was on the council of Svidrigailo,³⁹ and from 1446 to 1451 held the post of administrator of Volodimir. Pan Olizar Shilovich was termed a *zemianin* of Lutsk at the time of this grant but was administrator of Vladimir at least from 1461-75 and again from 1480-84. From 1480 to at least 1485, Olizar was *starosta* of Lutsk and in 1484 and 1485 was marshal of the Volynia land. Volchko Zhiaskovsky and *Boiarin* Demid apparently held no posts; at least no records thereof have been preserved.

The geographic areas involved are the provinces of Lutsk,⁴⁰ Vladimir,⁴¹ Peremyshl',⁴² and Putivl'.⁴³ There seems to be no appreciable difference in the number of rights granted to lands in the different provinces. Only one grant to land in Lutsk stands out as having more rights of economic exploitation, and that is the only grant which contains a reference to ores.⁴⁴ All other categories of rights seem to receive equal emphasis.

In the period up through 1514—that is, through the reign of Alexander, first as Great Prince of Lithuania 1492-1501, and then also as King of Poland 1501-06, and through the first eight years of the reign of Sigismund I, King of Poland and Great Prince of Lithuania—the categories of rights remain the same, but there is a great increase in the number of specific rights and in the number of land grants containing references to specific rights.⁴⁵

Only a few specific rights which appeared in previous periods are lacking: (1) water rights—to channels, shores, and little shores; (4) land rights—to hills, hummocks, and weeds; (5) forest rights—to birch groves; (6) honey rights—to bees (since rights to hives and hive lands are mentioned, the absence of any mention of bees seems of little practical significance); (7) subsoil rights—to ore forests. Otherwise all rights appear which appeared previously. The many new rights are (1) water rights—to bodies of water in general, runs and their sources, little lakes, dried-up lakes and drying-up lakes,⁴⁶ rivulets and ferrying; (3) hunting and fishing rights—to beaver dams, beaver banks, fish dams, little fish dams, and martens of the shore; (4) land rights—to ploughed and unploughed fields, hops, gardens, and dung; (5) forest rights—to sand pines and dense forests; (7) subsoil rights—to mines; (8) labor rights—to people, road-workers, vassals, fishermen, work of the subjugated, bonded household servants, serving people, and the services of vassals, households, villages, and serfs (*klepachi*); (9) revenue rights—honey, marten and beaver tributes, weekly measures (*vedry*) of wine, quitrents from farms, and imposts.

The most common specific rights are those to (1) ploughed land, (2) haying, (3) bee-lands, (4) rivers, (5) beaver catches, (6) ponds, (7) lakes, (8) honey tributes, and (9) money tributes, in that order. Except in a few grants, restricted in scope,⁴⁷ the various categories are almost invariably represented by some specific rights, with the exception of milling rights⁴⁸ and subsoil rights. Milling rights appear in only about half of the grants and subsoil rights only in one.

The grants were made to princes, to pans, to lesser gentry, bearing the title of boyar, *boiarin*, *dvorianin*, or *zemianin*, and to persons without titles. There is a difference in the number of rights granted to persons of princely rank. Although some princes received grants containing few specific rights, most princes received land grants with many specific rights, and almost all of such grants were to princes.⁴⁹ The only exceptions are grants to Man'ko Kalusovsky, a scribe, to Bogdan Koreevich, a *boiarin* of Minsk, and to Tomko and Bogush Sachkovich Koilensky, residents of Volynia, and to Esko Ivanovich of Bel'sk.⁵⁰ It does not

seem possible, generally, to establish any distinctions between men of non-princely rank, that is, between the pans, the scribes, a *mytnik*, and others. It is interesting to note, however, that the sole references to subsoil rights are in the above-mentioned grant to Man'ko Kalusovsky, the scribe. Although non-princes obtained control of inhabitants and other people, most grants referring specifically to road-workers,⁵¹ vassals,⁵² tribute-payers,⁵³ work of the subjugated,⁵⁴ bonded household servants,⁵⁵ and all services,⁵⁶ were made to princes. There are, however, occasional references to road-workers and taxable people⁵⁷ and to all services⁵⁸ in grants to non-princes. The term for "services" even appeared in two earlier documents, to non-princes, one to an unidentified member of the nobility⁵⁹ and the other to Pan Olizar Shilovich Kirdeevich.⁶⁰ In spite of these exceptions, the princes generally were in a superior position. There are two reasonable explanations for this. Either princes had the right to specific services in addition to tributes, whereas other groups could not normally expect those services, or princes were eager, and in a position, to compel a nearly complete statement of their rights.

There appears to be some relationship between the connection of the recipient with the Lithuanian government and the act of granting rights. Thirty-four officials received grants with lists of rights.⁶¹ There were ten recipients of such grants whose relatives were officials in the Lithuanian government.⁶² Most of the governmental officials and relatives of governmental officials who received grants were not princes or pans, and none of the recipients were members of the great-princely council before or at the time of the grants analyzed. That might argue an attempt by the great prince to secure more service in the war with Moscow and to strengthen the lower nobility as a check to the magnates. The grants to non-princes pertained mainly to lands in the west; those to princes, to lands in the east.

Thirty-two donees apparently had no connection with the government.⁶³ Among them were Prince Timofei Ivanovich Kapusta, Prince Semion Mikhailovich Olel'kovich, Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky, Prince Feodor Feodorovich Chetvertenskii, and Prince Vasilii Mikhailovich Vereiskii. None of the above-mentioned princes received grants with the lists of economic rights prior to 1496, by which time many princes had deserted Lithuania for Moscow.⁶⁴ Most of such grants were issued to princes only from 1496 to 1499. Perhaps Alexander and, to a lesser extent, his successor Sigismund recognized the serious implications of desertion and decided to attempt to satisfy the desires of some of the princes with grants, hoping thereby to reduce the number of deserters. It is noteworthy that a relatively larger group of donees holding no office appeared during this period than appeared during previous periods.

The following governmental districts are mentioned: the governor-generalcy of Kiev,⁶⁵ the Volynia land,⁶⁶ the governor-generalcy of Polotsk,⁶⁷ the governor-generalcy of Troki,⁶⁸ the governor-generalcy of Vilna,⁶⁹ the governor-generalcy of Smolensk,⁷⁰ and a few others. The lengthy lists of rights mentioned above refer to lands in almost all of the districts, a fact which might lead to the generalization that the practice of making detailed lists had been extended by or during the period 1492-1514 to all the parts of Lithuanian Russia. The sole reference to subsoil rights occurs in a grant to lands in the *povet* of Vladimir, in the Volynia land.⁷¹

Strangely, the right to beaver catches, which prior to 1492 appeared in all grants to Lutsk lands, with the exception of a grant which spelled out only two

rights,⁷² appears after 1492 in only one grant.⁷³ It might be suggested that beaver were disappearing from the *povet* of Lutsk, that existing beaver dams were well under the control of the various donees, or that the Great Prince of Lithuania tended to reserve beaver rights for himself as he did in a document relative to some lands in Polotsk.⁷⁴

ECONOMIC RIGHTS GRANTED BY NOBLES

There are many land grants from nobles to churchly organizations or individuals. It is possible that they might reveal rights which are not contained in grants to nobles but which might be implicit therein. No new categories appear, but certain specific rights hitherto unmentioned are to be found: to sturgeon,⁷⁵ oats, and pease.⁶⁷ Certain privileges are prohibited in a charter granted by Prince Iur'i Semionovich Lingvenev Mstislavsky, privileges which he either enjoyed himself or observed others enjoying—namely, the right of taking the peasant's plow, sickle, axe, and cart, of demanding a cast net, postilion, and transport.⁷⁷ Thus the information, derived from land grants *by* nobles to churchly organizations or individuals, does not indicate any new categories of economic rights which might have been implicit in land grants *to* nobles. It is possible that certain rights were contained in grants to nobles or by nobles in the period after 1514 which might have been implicit in grants prior to that date.⁷⁸ Gardens⁷⁹ and overgrowth⁸⁰ receive greater attention. Except for rights to persons performing special services, listed in one grant, no new rights appear.⁸¹ A few rights are rephrased. One category, that of milling rights, appears in almost every grant.

References to lakes are less frequent, but water rights in general appear with the same frequency. The only category to have disappeared is that of subsoil rights. It is interesting to speculate why that category appeared regularly only in the grants of Svidrigailo. In Poland subsoil deposits were being exploited by the crown, the Catholic Church, and the vast nobility.⁸² Perhaps Svidrigailo was granting rights which were generally enjoyed by the nobility of Poland but not by the nobility of Lithuania. Perhaps he was implementing the Lithuanian Privileges. (These will be discussed later.) They promised that the Lithuanian nobility would receive the same rights as were enjoyed by the Polish nobility. It is possible that, by granting subsoil rights, he placed the nobility of Volynia in a position superior to that of the nobility of the rest of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

In contrast to the general tendency to increase rights, the right to hops was apparently not granted after 1514. However, that right was at no time frequent, appearing only twice during the period 1492-1514,⁸³ and at no time prior to the last-named period.

In summation, it seems unlikely that grants after 1514 reveal any significant information as to possible rights of economic exploitation implicit in earlier documents. Nine categories of rights have emerged in the period after 1514, water, milling, hunting and fishing, land, forest, honey, subsoil, labor, and revenue rights. With the exception of subsoil rights these categories have appeared in most of the grants throughout the period under consideration. The number of specific rights within each category tended to increase considerably in the charters of Svidrigailo and to decline at first under Casimir IV and then to rise again steadily until by 1514 their number had far surpassed that of the days of Svidrigailo. The largest early listings appear to have occurred in the western part of Lithuanian Russia, near Poland in Lutsk and Volodimir provinces, but eventually large listings occurred throughout Lithuanian Russia. That sequence might argue

influence from Poland. The quality of the rights granted seems to bear no relationship to the title of the noble recipient, whether he was styled prince, pan, boyar, *dvorianin*, *boiarin*, *zemianin*, scribe, master cook, or *khoruzhii*. On the other hand, the quantity of rights was generally greater in grants to princes.

POLITICAL RIGHTS

The next category of rights to be considered is that of political and politico-economic rights.⁸⁴ Certain categories of these appear in grants. They are (1) rights of disposition—selling, exchanging, redeeming, restoring to the great prince and giving to the Church; (2) rights of ownership—ruling, imposing obligations on inhabitants, being free from the interference and damaging actions of great-princely agents, and being free from limitations of ownership in favor of the great prince or his descendants; (3) rights of improvement—turning to advantage, expanding, increasing, settling, making use of virgin soil, and doing what seems best; (4) judicial rights—judging, defending and absolving; and (5) military rights—being free from campaigns.

In the period 1377-1430 all categories but number 5 appear.⁸⁵ Only in four cases,⁸⁶ in documents issued by Svidrigailo and Vitovt, is there mention of rights of disposition. The other documents were not issued by great princes or by near relatives and great princes, except for one in which Vitovt expressly prohibited disposition without permission.⁸⁷ The right of ownership is explicit in these five documents. The categories and specific rights mentioned are (1) rights of disposition—selling, exchanging, restoring and giving to the church; (2) rights of ownership—ruling, imposing obligations, being free from harm and interference; (3) rights of improvement—turning to advantage, expanding, increasing, using virgin soil; and (4) judicial rights—judging, defending, and absolving.

Most documents refer to different geographic areas; therefore, except for the general westward location of the lands granted, no conclusions can be drawn from a consideration of the geographic factor.

All the recipients are without title.

Grants by Svidrigailo in the subsequent period indicate greater emphasis upon rights of improvement.⁸⁸ Specific rights mentioned in that category are to turn to advantage,⁸⁹ to expand,⁹⁰ to use virgin soil,⁹¹ to settle,⁹² and to increase.⁹³ The right of disposition appears in over half of these grants.⁹⁴

Ten of these grants deal with holdings in Volynia.⁹⁵ It might be suggested that greater emphasis was laid on rights of improvement in this area nearer Poland. All grants are to non-princes.

In grants by Casimir 1442-92,⁹⁶ categories 1 to 5 appear with following specific rights: (1) rights of disposition—selling, exchanging, giving; (2) rights of ownership—ruling, being free from the interference of princely agents, and being free from limitations of ownership in favor of the great prince or his descendants; (3) rights of improvement—turning to advantage, expanding, increasing, making use of virgin soil and doing what seems best; (4) judicial rights—judging alone and judging together with a prince or his agent; and (5) military rights—being free from campaigns. The last appears for the first time in grants dated 1488.⁹⁷

Certain differences emerge from a geographic analysis of the distribution of these rights. Whereas the grants to lands in the Volynia land⁹⁸ and in Vilna⁹⁹ lay great stress upon rights of improvement, half of the grants to lands farther east and north¹⁰⁰ guarantee the right to judge,¹⁰¹ although that right may be limited by the right of the great prince to assist in judging.¹⁰² It is conceivable

that full or partial judicial immunity was by no means as well known in the more westerly parts of Lithuania as in the more easterly parts.

Examined from the point of view of the rank of the recipients, these grants add further to an understanding of the position of the nobility in the Lithuanian-Russian state. Many of the landholders were princes.¹⁰³ As a group the princes seem to have had greater rights, yet a comparison of two Lutsk grants, one to a non-prince, Pan Semashko Epifanovich,¹⁰⁴ and the other to Prince Mikhail Konstantinovich,¹⁰⁵ reveals exactly the same rights granted by Casimir in 1452 to the two men. Who had the right of judging? That right was enjoyed by princes from the east, the Novosil'skys, Odоеvskys, Vorotynskys, and Mozhaïskys. To be sure, these men were once *udel'nye* princes; their previous autonomous status may have been the source of this right. There remains the uncomfortable fact of Prince Mikhail Konstantinovich further west. May we assume that the geographic factor is decisive? Perhaps, but it is quite likely that the princes in that part of Lithuania nearest Muscovite Russia were accustomed to rights enjoyed as independent princes and that they were unwilling to give up those rights to the Great Prince of Lithuania. They or their forefathers may have decided in the course of the first half of the fifteenth century that it was safer to give up independence in exchange for the protection of Lithuania.¹⁰⁶ That decision need not have involved the decision to identify themselves with the nobility of Lithuania. Indeed there is much evidence to the contrary.

In the period from the death of Casimir to the acquisition by Moscow of Smolensk (1492-1514) all categories of rights are mentioned, with the following additional specific formulations: (1) rights of disposition—redeeming, restoring and granting to the church, (2) rights of ownership—being free from possible seizure by descendants of the great prince.¹⁰⁷

Examined by geographic area, this group of grants does not reveal any significant differences. From Vilna to Vladimir, rights of disposition appear;¹⁰⁸ however, there is no example of such rights in the *povel* of Lutsk. There is a markedly larger proportion of grants of land in the governor-generalcy of Smolensk after 1494.¹⁰⁹

Examined by the rank or title of the recipient, these grants reveal that the princes were ceasing to enjoy the advantage of having more rights than any of the lesser nobility. A non-prince was the only recipient to obtain freedom from campaigning.¹¹⁰ Apparently the right to judge might not be considered part of the normal complement of rights.¹¹¹ The absence of that right indicates either that it was assumed to be part of the normal grant or that that function was not almost universally exercised by the agents of the Great Princes of Lithuania. The same alternatives may apply where the specific right of being free from the interference of princely agents is absent.

An examination of the years 1377-1514 reveals that rights of disposition, ownership, and improvement were the only categories present in all periods and that the specific rights of ruling and increasing were those most frequently mentioned. The princes received fewest grants during 1377-1430 and the most during 1492-1514. The opposite was true of persons without titles and of functionaries. Pans were most frequent beneficiaries during 1430-92. Again it appears that areas nearest Poland received the larger number of rights in the years following 1377 and that by the end of the fifteenth century the number tended to be equal regardless of the area involved. One exception to this general development is the

frequency and location of grants with judicial rights. They all appeared in areas to the east and up through 1495.

RESTRICTIONS

It is not enough to examine those rights actually granted to nobles; it is necessary to examine as well restrictions on the rights of nobles, rights granted by nobles, rights granted by the great princes to churchly organizations or people, and rights granted after 1514, in order to determine whether any of the trends which appeared in the rights already examined were in any way negated and whether those rights granted were accompanied by implied rights which were rarely or never mentioned.

The possible restrictions on nobles' rights specifically mentioned in charters are not numerous. These restrictions take three forms: (1) absence of mention of political rights, (2) express prohibitions, and (3) duties.

NON-MENTION OF RIGHTS

The most numerous documents not mentioning specific political rights are those of the earliest and latest of the periods discussed, 1377-1430 and 1492-1514.¹¹² The intervening periods, 1430-52 and 1452-92, are sparsely represented. Only thirteen grants without mention of political rights were made to princes: to Princes Vasilii and Andrei Sokolinsky as compensation for damage done them by Prince Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky, to Prince Roman Volkonsky, granting him a village in Putivl'¹¹⁴ to Prince Semion Ivanovich Vladimirovich,¹¹⁵ to Prince Olekhno Vasilevich Glazynich,¹¹⁶ to Prince Andrei Kromsky,¹¹⁷ to Prince Ivan Iur'evich Trubetskoi,¹¹⁸ to Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky,¹¹⁹ to Prince Bogdan Feodorovich Glinsky,¹²⁰ to Prince Dmitri Putiata,¹²¹ to Prince Timofei Kapusta,¹²² and to Prince Feodor Mosal'sky.¹²³ These grants were dated from 1482 on. The fact that only thirteen are available suggests that princes generally had political rights. All other such grants excepting five were to boyars or to individuals without titles. Thus it appears that though previous information makes it clear that grants of rights were not reserved for holders of a princely title, nevertheless such holders did have an advantage: They rarely received grants without specific political rights. Governmental officials seem to have shared this advantage. The number of officials receiving grants without political rights is proportionately smaller than the number of officials receiving grants with such rights.

An examination of these documents by geographic area reveals that they are well distributed throughout Lithuania; however, when grants without political rights were made to princes, they generally referred to lands in the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

The meaning of a grant without political rights is clarified by a grant of 1510 by Sigismund I to Mikhail Pavsha.¹²⁴ The little settlement (*selishcho*) of Klimiatin had fallen to the stepdaughter of the wife of Iuri Smaga, who died without heirs, for which reason it became part of Sigismund's holdings in the region of Cherkassy. He then granted the settlement to Mikhail apparently for his lifetime, with all the rights exercised by the aforementioned Iuri Smaga. That might suggest that many of the grants were without specific rights. Previous grants, the record of which is not now accessible, existed at the time of subsequent grants which are recorded. It would be unwise to try to explain the failure to mention lists of rights by assuming a desire to save paper work, for how then may one

explain the repetitions in so many documents? It is likely that an individual would have been satisfied to receive a grant which might be vague? It is likely that the Great Prince of Lithuania would issue a vague grant unless its vagueness were to be an advantage to him? It is possible that the great princes made specific rights clear only when it was to their own interest—in other words, when the rights granted exceeded those previously granted on the same land, and it was essential to indicate precisely by how much, to prevent the exercise of rights beyond those intended; or when the rights granted were fewer than those previously granted and it was essential to indicate clearly how much the new holder had lost. These possibilities call for an analysis of several sets of two or more grants of the same piece of land. That will be attempted later.

The above-cited settlement of Klimiatin was held by Mikhail Pavsha from November 5, 1510, to August 25, 1512. On the later date he granted it to the Nikolaevsky-Pustynsky Monastery of Kiev.¹²⁵ In his grant he guaranteed "to retain nothing for himself of that holding" and to grant it "eternally." Apparently he did not have the authority to do that. In the grant of 1510 to him there was no mention of any right of disposition and on December 6, 1514, Sigismund confirmed Mikhail's grant. Yet other grants by nobles or non-nobles to monasteries did not normally contain an appended confirmation from the reigning great prince. Thus it seems likely that the very presence of a great prince's confirmation proves that the right to dispose of land was not inherent in the earlier charter to Mikhail Pavsha in which it was not explicit.

Most probably, in order to be enjoyed, a right had to be mentioned in a grant. The only exceptions to the principle might be found in the retention of rights by autonomous princes and in the existence of rights mentioned specifically in laws for the entire Great Principality of Lithuania. Once the council or the parliament approved a law, it might be expected to apply to all rights to lands in categories specifically mentioned. In spite of the provisions of the laws or privileges, it is probable that the necessity of mentioning rights in land grants continued because provisions of the privileges reflected practices in Poland or in the western part of Lithuania, practices which only slowly spread throughout the Lithuanian state.

EXPRESS PROHIBITIONS

The number of express prohibitions, the second type of restriction, was not great. There were prohibitions against the right of disposition in the first two periods, one to a Pan Bedrikh by Vitovt,¹²⁶ one to Stanislav Dziadek by Vitovt,¹²⁷ and another to Ersh Tereshkovich and Vasilii Tolkachevich by Svidrigailo.¹²⁸ The others concerned princes exclusively. Two dealt specifically with Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky. Prince Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky asserted that Mozhaisky had no right to enter his lands,¹²⁹ although he was apparently subordinate to the latter; and Casimir informed the people of Briansk that their new lord, Mozhaisky, had no right to enter church lands or to drive people from their lands.¹³⁰ This last stipulation was also made in grants to Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky of Chernigov, Starodub, Gomel, Khotiml, and Karachev in 1496 and 1499.¹³¹ Another grant specified that Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky had no right to enter the lands of boyars who had holdings on the land granted him.¹³² All of these prohibitions occur in grants further east. Not one of them refers to a holding in the western part of Lithuania. The infrequency of these prohibitions suggests that they may have resulted from individual violations either

of the terms of earlier charters or of the law of the land. The latter hypothesis seems reasonable when it is realized that the region involved was one which until the middle of the fifteenth century had only nominal connections with the rest of Lithuania. It is likely that the prohibitions of "disposition" resulted from the desire of Vitovt and Svidrigailo to retain pre-eminent rights to the lands involved. Strangely, no other prohibitions occurred in grants to persons without titles.

There is another type of implicit or explicit prohibition, that against continued holding of lands either by the holder or by his heirs. The number of grants with an express prohibition is small, but since most grants say nothing about continued holding of lands, they do not give the right of continued holding and so probably prohibit it implicitly. The number of grants guaranteeing lands to the holder, his wife, their children, and their future possible descendants eternally is small in comparison with those containing no such statement. The formula "for one life" emphasized that the land reverted to the great prince on the death of the holder.¹³³ The formula "at will" or "until our visitation" reserved to the great prince the right to retake the land whenever he wished.¹³⁴

Neither the social structure nor a geographic pattern emerges from an analysis of this type of prohibition.

DUTIES

The third type of restrictions, duties, forms an interesting category, revealing much about the practices in the early part of the fifteenth century. "For his whole life he is to be available with all his people for the defense of our Premyshl' land . . . and those services and dues and payments he may work and give for our use,"¹³⁵ ordained Great Prince Vitovt of Esif Bedun. Or Grigor Sambor ". . . may serve with horses. . . ."¹³⁶ Svidrigailo required that Dragosinovich pay "from every *kmetia* two Polish grosh of Cracow minting per year . . . and [furnish] for our use horses and two archers,"¹³⁷ and that the master cook, Pan Peter Myshchich, furnish two horses.¹³⁸ Casimir required Feodor Zhuk and Khodor to supply his prefect with "two archers for war beyond the portage."¹³⁹ One common element in all of these specified duties is the obligation to perform military service. In the first case cited that obligation was extensive, applying to defense of the entire land of Premyshl'.

All of these required duties are in grants to lands in the north and west. This might lead to the false conclusion that because military duties were performed after 1444, and because there were few releases from military obligations, military service was expected of all recipients of grants who were not specifically exempted. The specific mention of military service in grants to the north and west might therefore indicate that the obligation of military service was not customary in that region.

None of the persons specifically obligated by the above charters to perform military service were princes. This fact might show that autonomous and former *udel'nye* princes had already assumed, voluntarily or under pressure, the obligation of military service when their lands had become part of Lithuania, and that the regional princes customarily performed military service; whereas upon the issuances of grants those without princely titles may have been confronted for the first time with a service obligation to the great prince.

In the second half of the fifteenth century and in the early years of the sixteenth century there are many examples of the obligation to perform services.¹⁴⁰ It is possible that such services included military service, although only one makes specific mention of "service in war."¹⁴¹ Of the forty-nine examples discovered,

twenty-five relate to Kiev, Briansk, and Smolensk. Of the twenty-five, sixteen relate to Smolensk in the period from 1481 on. That would seem to suggest, not that services were unknown in any specific part of Lithuania, but that at a time when services were by no means on the increase generally, a great increase was taking place in the governor-generalcy of Smolensk. It may well have been an effort to oblige the nobles in more easterly parts of the Lithuanian-Russian state. It would seem to mean that greater control, at least of Smolensk, if not at all eastern Lithuania, was being sought by the great prince.¹⁴²

From this analysis of the limitations placed on the recipients of grants a few general conclusions emerge. (1) Limitations were concentrated in those parts of Lithuania farthest away from Poland and from Polish influence. (2) Limitations were imposed mainly on boyars and on pans but infrequently on princes except insofar as any protection of rights of others might imply limitations. (3) They increased the power of the great princes of Lithuania. (4) The absence of specific mention of a right or a duty implied the nonexistence of the right or duty, unless the laws of Lithuania made blanket provision for it.

POLITICAL RIGHTS GRANTED BY NOBLES

The rights granted by nobles may be divided into two categories: (1) those to lesser nobles and non-titled persons and (2) those to churchly organizations or persons. Princes, usually the descendants of former *udel'nye* princes who had joined Lithuania, were most frequently the grantors of rights to lesser nobles and non-titled persons.¹⁴³ Rights of disposition and military rights are lacking. Apparently no one but the Great Prince of Lithuania had the power to permit persons to dispose of land or to avoid military service. On the other hand, it seems unreasonable to assume that if land were granted with rights of disposition, those rights would not follow the land. Only in grants from the reign of Vitovt did nobles confer judicial rights on the recipients. Perhaps thereafter the judiciary was coming to be regulated by the Great Princes of Lithuania: This suggestion is supported by the jurisdictional provisions of the code of 1468.¹⁴⁴ The most common right, of course, is the right of ownership, or holding, whether it be buttressed by the promise of the donor not to retain anything for himself or by his promise that his descendants will not be legally able to take back the land granted,¹⁴⁶ or if it be expressed implicitly by the act of granting.¹⁴⁷ Unfortunately there is no indication of the location of the lands granted, except that two of the grants presumably refer to the *voevodstvo* of Vilna or to Chernigov-Seversk, since they were made by Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky.¹⁴⁸

Most of the grants by nobles were of lands in the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state, very likely because there were more former autonomous princes in the eastern part and these princes would be more likely to grant lands with the right of disposition, since they or their ancestors presumably did so before joining the Lithuanian-Russian state.

The grants by nobles to churchly organizations are far more numerous than the grants by nobles to nobles and reveal much more as to the powers of the nobility and their inherent rights. Most of them are concentrated in the period 1492-1514.¹⁴⁹

The political rights granted by nobles to churchly organizations and individuals may be divided into two categories: (1) rights of ownership—ruling,¹⁵⁰ being free from the interference of the grantors or their agents¹⁵¹ and being free from any reservations in favor of the grantor, or his descendants,¹⁵² and (2) judicial

rights—judging.¹⁵³ Occasionally the blanket phrase, “with all which pertained thereto,” informs the reader that there may have been other rights, not specifically mentioned but assumed.¹⁵⁴

The absence of any mention of the three other categories of rights appearing in great-princely grants—namely, rights of disposition, rights of improvement, and military rights—would seem to indicate that grantors other than great princes did not have the right to grant rights in these three categories. If nobles did have the power to grant the right of disposition, they would be unlikely to grant that right to a churchly organization, since they would probably intend that such an organization should enjoy the lands rather than dispose of them.

There were only a few grants with specific limitations on the political rights of the churchly organizations and individuals. Particularly illuminating is a grant by Pan Alexander Ivanovich Khodkevich to the Blagoveshchensky Monastery which in addition to accepting the possibility that the monastery might be either Orthodox or Catholic, promised all rights and rule and guaranteed to retain nothing for the grantor.¹⁵⁵ Alexander agreed to protect from harm the land granted, but he insisted on being a “buttress” of justice, retaining the right to acquit anyone found guilty, while the abbot and his brothers looked on. Obviously, then, Alexander was accustomed to ruling, protecting, and judging his people and did not wish to give up all his rights. An earlier grant by a Princess Kobrinskaia in 1491 to the Spassky Monastery of Kobrin specified that trials would be handled “with me in one awful court before merciful God.”¹⁵⁶ These isolated examples may indicate that there was a certain reluctance to grant the right to judge.

Such a conclusion seems warranted when it is realized that most of the grants to churchly organizations and individuals contain no reference whatsoever to political rights. The reasons for such omissions might be (1) unwillingness on the part of the grantors or (2) inability on the part of the grantors.

The majority of grants by nobles with or without political rights were given, not just by descendants of former *udel'nye* princes but by descendants of regional princes and by other princes with family names relating them to the ruling dynasty of Gedemin, such as Polotsky, Mstislavsky, Gol'shansky, and Kobrinsky. That fact suggests that the three kinds of princes had the right to dispose of their property by grants and if they chose, by grants containing specific political rights. Other nobles, too, made grants to churchly organizations.¹⁵⁷ The first such grant appeared in 1483.¹⁵⁸ The second such grant, which was at the same time the first grant by a non-prince with political rights, appeared in 1486.¹⁵⁹ It might follow that generally during the fifteenth century non-princes did not have the right to grant lands they held to churchly organizations and individuals, either with or without political rights. The above-mentioned non-princes exercising that right lived in Lutsk and Kiev respectively, and the others who made grants with or without rights came from the provinces of Cherkassy, Kiev, and Polotsk.¹⁶⁰ Only the latter was far removed from possible Polish influence. It is possible that all grants made by non-princes were subject to confirmation by the great prince. There exists the previously mentioned grant of 1510 by Sigismund I to Mikhail Pavsha of the *povei* of Cherkassy.¹⁶¹ Two years later Mikhail granted his holding to the Nikolaevsko-Pustynsky Monastery of Kiev.¹⁶² Sigismund I confirmed that grant in 1514. This single piece of evidence is insufficient substantiation of an hypothesis that grants by non-princes to churchly organizations or individuals required great-princely confirmation. But it does at least suggest that confirmation

was required for all grants of land originally made by the great princes or his predecessors.

Two conclusions emerge as indisputable: (1) princes made the overwhelming majority of grants to churchly organizations and individuals with or without political rights, and it was rare for a non-prince to make such a grant; (2) grants to churchly organizations and individuals generally did not contain political rights.

Grants to nobles by other nobles reveal little about the political rights enjoyed by the grantors.¹⁶³ The grants may be divided into two categories: (1) grants made as a result of sale, the original grants apparently containing the right of disposition and (2) grants made for service.

Grants resulting from sale were generally made by non-princely landholders. The first example of such a grant appears to be dated 1476.¹⁶⁴ That date is very close to the first date for a grant by a non-prince to a churchly group or organization, 1484. Thus the suggestion made earlier that it might have been impossible for non-princes to grant their holdings prior to the last quarter of the 15th century appears to be substantiated. However, there is a grant dated 1351, by Otto, *starosta* of Galich, to Pan Viatslav Dimitrovich.¹⁶⁵ Does the existence of this single document indicate that the above-mentioned hypothesis is wrong? Not necessarily. Otto was an official of the Lithuanian government. Perhaps he was acting on behalf of the great prince. That suggestion is not out of the question, because of the damaged state of the grant. If it had been permissible for non-princes to make grants, it is strange that there is not a single example of such a grant between 1351 and 1476.

Grants for service were generally made by princes, of whom almost all were descendants of Gedemin.

Of all the land grants cited at the beginning of this section, only one, containing specific political rights, bears a date earlier than 1515. It is a grant of 1503 by Prince Feodor Iaroslavovich Pinsky to Karp Karpovich, a *gospodarskii boiarin*.¹⁶⁶ That grant guarantees that neither Feodor Iaroslavovich nor his descendants will take back the land granted. At the same time it imposes the obligation to perform military service. Only one land grant after 1514 spells out political rights. It is by Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky to *boiarin* Andrei Strezhich', dated 1520.¹⁶⁷ Mikhail promised not to interfere and allowed Andrei the right to judge. The other grants contain either the ambiguous blanket phrase "with all that pertained thereto"¹⁶⁸ or nothing at all in the way of political rights. A geographical analysis reveals only that most of the grants occurred in Southwest Russia.

In sum, the grants by nobles to nobles tell little as to the political rights enjoyed by the grantors.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing analysis of the rights appearing in land grants, some conclusions may be drawn which will help to determine the motives of the West-Russian nobles in deserting Lithuania. Six factors appear significant: (1) the title of the noble, (2) his place of residence, (3) his connection with the government, (4) his gain or loss of economic power, (5) his gain or loss of political power, and (6) his resultant position, relative to that of others in his society.

If the noble were a prince, both descended from either a previously autonomous prince or a regional prince of the Lithuanian ruling family, and resided in the western part of Lithuania, especially in Volynia, he had a fair chance of receiving a grant of land with extensive economic rights, especially if he was a govern-

ment official. To be sure, in the time of Vitovt he was the object of discrimination, because Vitovt sought to centralize state power. From the time of Svidrigailo, however, he began to enjoy the grant of economic rights in an increasing measure. He never received a large quantity of political rights. Notable is the total absence of any grant in the southwest, with the right of judging. If the prince lived in the east, he probably received no land grants at all until the reign of Casimir. At first his political rights were emphasized, particularly the right of judging, which was stressed in Polotsk. Only if he were a governmental official, and generally then in the reign of Alexander, did he receive grants with economic rights. Probably he believed he had those rights in the land which his ancestors had controlled since the days before Lithuanian domination. If he were not a governmental official, he may well have resented the lack of opportunity to acquire additional lands with such rights. Regardless of his official connections he was generally allowed the freedom of granting lands to the Orthodox Church.

If he were a noble of lesser rank than a prince, that is, a pan, a boyar, a *boiarin*, or a *zemianin*, living in Lithuania proper or in other western areas, regardless of whether he were a governmental official, he began to enjoy extensive economic rights as early as the reign of Vitovt. From the thirties to the seventies his chances of getting such grants were reduced unless he was an official. The rights granted during the remainder of Casimir's reign grew in number, and in the reign of Alexander there was great emphasis on the right of lesser nobles to control their vassals and exact services from them. Officials had some advantage, but only a very slight advantage, in the competition for such grants. The lesser nobles of Western Lithuania generally failed to acquire any large number of political rights, but did enjoy the right of disposition from 1494 on.

If the lesser noble lived in the east, in the seventies he began to receive grants with many specified economic rights. If he was a government official in the east, he never received such rights. The lesser noble began to enjoy greater political rights during the eighties. Especially in Smolensk from 1481 on, and to a lesser extent in Kiev and Briansk, more services were exacted from him. The lesser noble received many grants without specified rights. Some lesser nobles were allowed to give land to the Orthodox Church, but their gifts became valid only upon confirmation by the great prince. The lesser noble was probably well pleased at seeing his rights steadily increase so that he began to approach the position of a prince. If he was a governmental official in the east, he might envy the more lengthy lists of economic rights, especially from 1492 on, conferred on lesser nobles who held no offices.

Generally speaking, the prince, whether of east or west, had reason to resent the rise in the economic and political power of the lesser nobles. In the east his envy would have been directed against the lesser nobles who held no office, and in the west against those who did hold office.

Especially in the early years of the reign of Alexander, the government of Lithuania followed a policy in the east of playing off the lesser nobles against the princes. This policy probably antagonized the princes. One cannot know how successful the policy was in securing the loyalty of the lesser nobles. Insofar as Lithuanian policy tended to elevate the lesser noble, it probably helped to secure his loyalty, if loyalty results from the gain of political and economic power and social prestige. Such gains would have been more likely in the east than in the west. The princes, however, would have been more likely to be favorable to the Lithuanian government in the west than in the east. Initially during the drive

for centralization under Vitovt they were doubtless dissatisfied, but thereafter, growing accustomed to being mere nobles, rather than autonomous princes, they probably were pleased that they maintained a relatively strong position vis-à-vis the nobles of lesser rank. In the west the autonomous character of some of the princes lasted through 1514, but most of them saw their power diminishing under Casimir and under Alexander up to the year 1496. Consequently, they probably resented the Lithuanian government's policies. From 1496 on, they might have been more nearly satisfied, since they received more grants.

Governmental agents, generally, should have been pleased, because of the preference shown them in land grants, throughout Lithuania, except in the areas of Polotsk, Vitebsk, Smolensk, and Chernigov-Seversk. In the latter areas, the desirable land grants were reserved for those agents who were princes, generally of the locality. Apparently, in order to avoid antagonizing co-operative nobles in the east, the Lithuanian government deliberately refrained from favoring agents from other parts of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

Tending partially to counterbalance the advantages granted to the lesser nobility of the east were the imposition of explicit restrictions, the omission of rights, and the drive for the exaction of services in Smolensk, Briansk, and Kiev. The princes and officeholders from the lesser nobility were less subject to these restrictions than the non-office-holding lesser nobility.

Paradoxically, grants represented both an increase and a decrease in the authority of the central government: an increase, insofar as princes were obliged slowly to concede the right of the government to define their powers through grants, but a decrease in that lesser nobles received powers formerly exercised by the local governing authority, either an agent of the central Lithuanian government or an autonomous prince whose powers the Lithuanian government might have expected to acquire.

IV. RIGHTS OF THE NOBILITY AS REVEALED IN PRIVILEGES

It is inadequate to examine the rights and privileges of the nobility of Lithuanian Russia only in terms of the rights which they acquired through land grants or in terms of the rights which they were in a position to grant to others. The laws of Lithuanian Russia are another source of the rights and privileges of the Lithuanian-Russian nobility. Moreover, they furnish additional clues and confirm evidence already discussed regarding the decisions of West Russian boyars to desert Lithuania for Moscow. The laws are (1) the Privilege of 1387, (2) the pledge of the Lithuanian nobility of 1401, (3) the Union of Horodlo of 1413, (4) the Privilege of 1434, (5) the Privilege of 1447, (6) the code of 1468, (7) the Privilege of 1492, (8) the draft union of 1501, (9) the Privileges of 1506.¹ These documents reveal some, but not all, of the rights revealed in the land grants, as well as other rights which are logical extensions of those in the land grants. Discussion of various articles of the laws and a comparison of them with earlier findings in the land grants will clarify the meaning of the laws. It will not always be possible to limit the discussion to the chronological period of the law under consideration. Nor would such procedure be altogether fruitful or conducive to a clear understanding of practices of the fifteenth century Lithuanian government. On the one hand, laws may be regarded as accurate reflections of practices, or as attempts to apply customs and the exigencies of the moment to a specific situation. On the other hand, laws need not be considered accurate reflections of practices: they may also be heralds of change, attempts to introduce new practices. When considering practices, one is justified in examining laws of periods other than those under immediate scrutiny.

The Privilege of 1387 was granted by Jagailo to Lithuania proper,—i.e., not to Lithuanian Russia or Ruthenia, as it is sometimes called. In 1377 Jagailo had succeeded to the title of Great Prince of Lithuania after the death of his father. Because his uncle Keistut had controlled Troki and disputed his right to all Lithuania, Jagailo had been obliged to struggle for control of the country. Upon the assassination of Keistut in 1382, Jagailo became undisputed master of Lithuania. At this very time the Poles were encountering difficulties with the Teutonic Order and were seeking to ally themselves more closely with the Lithuanians, with whom they from time to time tended to make common cause. As a consequence, Poles began to see in Jagailo not only a desired ally but also a husband for Hedwig, the Queen of Poland. Negotiations led to the Krevo Union between Poland and Lithuania, the marriage of Jagailo to Hedwig, and the accession of Jagailo to the Polish throne. From 1386 to 1392 Jagailo was not only King of Poland but also Great Prince of Lithuania. In 1392 he was obliged to surrender the latter position to his cousin Vitovt.² The Privilege of 1387, then, was issued while Jagailo was still Great Prince of Lithuania.³

The Privilege of 1387 had as its avowed aim the increase of the Holy Faith and the strengthening of the Roman Catholic religion. Therefore, it was granted not to boyars generally but only to "those baptized and wishing to be baptized."⁴ Rights were granted to nobles, to their widows "who observe the Catholic rite," and to future possible second wives.

The Privilege granted rights which were generally political. Such political rights were limited to boyars who already had inherited land from their fathers. For all practical purposes the rights were bestowed upon those who had im-

portant posts in the Lithuanian government, for only such boyars would be likely to meet both the religious and property requirements. All rights which appear are (1) rights of ownership—having, holding, and possessing, (2) rights of disposition—selling, transferring ownership by sale, exchanging, giving, and donating, and (3) rights of improvement—converting to the individual's own acceptable uses.

The judicial rights of nobles were modest. Jagailo specified: "We wish . . . one judge to hear quarrels, to mete out punishment conforming to the custom and to the law . . . of our kingdom of Poland. . . ." That statement is ambiguous, for it does not make clear whether a specific noble could judge cases by himself as was the practice in Poland; moreover, it does not indicate what body of law was available to judges. Actually the provision seems to have had little significance in bolstering the power of the nobles, for judges were generally great-princely appointees except when judicial immunity was granted, relative to a specific area.

In addition, all rights enjoyed by the nobility of Poland were granted to the nobility of Lithuania or, more specifically, to the higher nobility. The failure to list those rights may indicate that the listing of rights was deemed important only when it served to strengthen rights which had been in the process of developing in Lithuania prior to the union with Poland. If such were the case then, the unlisted rights enjoyed by the nobility of Poland might have been regarded as theoretical so far as the Lithuanian nobility was concerned.

Jagailo stated that he did not wish the boyars, whom he termed weapon-bearers (*armigeros*), "to be obligated to any labors of ours or our successors except when the whole Lithuanian land will be called for the construction of a new castle." But he did require military service and the obligation to facilitate the passage of a military expedition as often as it might be suitable "to pursue enemies and adversaries of ours and of our Lithuanian land itself."

He promised that no penalties would be imposed upon those who averred their Catholic faith. Presumably non-Catholics who failed to perform the labors from which Catholic boyars were exempt would be subject to penalties.⁵

There is no specific treatment in the Privilege of 1387 of that group, the former *udel'nye* princes of Lithuanian Russia who, it has been suggested, may not have had the right to enter church lands, boyar lands, and lands of the people located within or in the vicinity of the holdings of such princes.⁶ But such prohibitions did not occur in the land grants until 1448. Perhaps, then, the *udel'nye* princes had previously tended to disregard rights to other landholders, rights hallowed by local custom, but as the princes came to be more dependent upon the Great Principality of Lithuania, they were under pressure to pay attention to those rights. The absence of any mention of prohibitions against violations of the rights of non-princely landholders by *udel'nye* princes is an indication either that the government of Lithuania could not pretend to protect those rights or that violations of such rights had not come to the attention of the rulers. The former probability seems much greater.

Nor is there any specific treatment in the Privilege of 1387 of the regional princes, the Gedeminovichi, with whom Vitovt was to struggle after 1392 and with whom Jagailo had struggled since his accession to the throne. Perhaps the logical reason for the failure to mention the regional princes is that the Privilege of 1387 was basically an attempt to strengthen those elements of the upper no-

bility of Lithuania proper who co-operated with the ruler. Some of the regional princes lived outside of Lithuania proper, and thus would be excluded because of their geographical location, and others who happened to live inside Lithuania proper would be excluded because of their power which could be viewed as an impediment to the power of the Great Prince of Lithuania.

It is interesting to note that many of the regional princes⁷ joined Moscow during the period 1377-1408.⁸

The question whether or not a non-princely noble had the right to grant lands with political rights finds no answer in this privilege.⁹

An examination of the Privilege of 1387 and comparison of its articles with the charters granted at that time or a little later lead to the following conclusions: (1) political rights with economic implications were part of the normal gain to a Lithuanian noble landowner of the upper group, if he became Catholic; (2) judicial immunity was not complete; (3) the *udel'nye* princes were not subject to restrictions in the internal affairs of their lands; and (4) no service was required of upper-level Lithuanian Catholic nobles except the construction of new fortifications, the granting of free passage to great-princely troops in time of war, and the performance of military service, although many services were required of other boyars.

The pledge of the Lithuanian nobility of 1401 states the same basic aim as the Privilege of 1387, namely "the perfection of Catholic works."¹⁰ It is a pledge to "act for the common good" with Poland. Moreover, it is a promise by the nobility to adhere to Poland after the death of the current Great Prince Vitovt: ". . . in the sweetness of faith and by the bowels of Jesus Christ, we shall maintain a perpetual and irrevocable union."

The pledge, while not revealing any special rights of the nobility of Lithuania, does, by its very existence, imply the right of nobles to adhere to a great prince of their choosing. Inasmuch as the choice of adhering to Poland represented a diplomatic step, it may be said that the nobility of Lithuania was assisting in the formulation of Lithuanian foreign policy.¹¹

The pledge makes it clear that a large body of the Lithuanian nobility had joined the Catholic Church, for all of the signers proclaimed themselves Catholic.¹² Inasmuch as many of the signers held important posts in the Lithuanian government and because they were ancestors of later officials, it is worth mentioning them by name. One of the basic assumptions, necessary for the identification of the religion of officials, is that those who signed as Catholics actually were Catholics. Such identification helps to determine the extent to which Orthodox held offices at a later time. The signers were Jacob, Bishop of Vilna; Prince Ivan Oligmuntovich with his sons Andrei and Semion; Minigailo Gedigoldovich¹³ and his brother; Semion Iamuntovich; Marshal Stanislav Czupurna; Feodor L'vovich and his brother, Iushko; Gashov and his son Talnush; Gineit and his son Milush; Kynunt and his son Davkha; Gasztold and his brother; Nemir and his brothers; Shugailo; Olizar Vasil'evich (Vessilitsky?), Voinad Rushilovich, Kezgailo Volimuntovich, Golgin and their brothers; Roman Mileikovich and his brother Volchko; Voishiund and his son Radivil; Volochko Kavodmovich and his brothers; Butoldmuntigailo Montygirdovich and Hannush Montygirdovich and their brothers; Dovoino Vishigirdovich; Drovmutis and his son Veshko; Volochko Utrovich, Volochko Konshovtovich, Dovgird, Voijnis Wrdzych and their brothers; Goligiud; Veydimin; and Heshis Selkovich.¹⁴

The so-called Union of Horodlo of 1413 consists of two parts. The first part is an agreement between Jagailo, King of Poland, and his cousin Vitovt, Great Prince of Lithuania.¹⁵ The avowed aim of the agreement was the same as that of the Privilege of 1387—namely, the “increase of the Catholic faith” (Article II), an aim which was reaffirmed by the promise to preserve Church lands (Article IV) and by the promise to elect to public office only “worshippers in the Catholic faith and subjects of the Holy Roman Church” (Article XI).

That aim was to be accomplished by a confederation of the nobility of Lithuania and Poland for their common welfare and mutual protection against religious and secular enemies (Article III). That confederation was strengthened by the establishment of similar positions in the government service of Lithuania as in that of Poland,¹⁶ that is, the posts of palatin, or *voevoda* and of *castellanus* or pan in Vilna, Troki, and wherever else Vitovt might see fit (Article XI), and by the promise that upon the demise of Jagailo and Vitovt, neither the Polish nobility nor the Lithuanian would elect successors to their respective rulers without the knowledge and advice of the other (Article XIII). Furthermore, they indicate the contents of otherwise unknown letters between Poland and Lithuania from seven or eight years prior to 1413 (Article XV).

As a result of this confederation and possibly with the aim of strengthening it, the Catholic nobility of Lithuania received many rights. The mention of these rights is an indication of the increased power of the nobility. The rights include in general all rights enjoyed by the nobility of Poland (Article V), but, again, since many of the rights of the Polish nobility are not discussed, we may consider them unimportant. Political rights with economic implications appear as (1) rights of ownership—holding of patrimony and freedom from interference of princely agents, (2) rights of disposition—selling, exchanging, and giving, and (3) rights of improvement—converting to the grantee’s own uses (Article VI). Judicial rights are lacking. Freemen are not to be deprived of inherited goods, but to possess them with their descendants.¹⁷ Boyars are given the right to assign dotal property or holdings to their wives (Article VII).¹⁸ In addition, forty-seven noble families received the right to bear the coats of arms and heraldic insignia of the nobility of Poland, as long as they were “not schismatics or other infidels” (Article XIV). All the Catholic nobility received the right to a Polish-Lithuanian Parliament to meet in Parchov, or in Lublin (Article XVI).

The Lithuanian nobility was charged with certain obligations: (1) constructing and erecting castles, making military roads and giving tribute (Article VIII);¹⁹ (2) the general obligation to serve and to be faithful to the Christian faith (Article IX); (3) the duty not to be enemy to Poland (Article X); and (4) the duty to remain loyal to “us and our successors”²⁰ (Article XII).

Comparing the rights specified in the above agreement with those contained in the charters for the period 1377-1430, we discover the same rights of ownership, of disposition, and of improvement.

The right of inheritance is not new. We have encountered the phrase, “to him, his wife, children and their future possible descendants eternally.” But is it to be assumed that the absence of any mention of that phrase in one of the land grants means that the recipient was not a freeman? Such a conclusion would force still another conclusion—namely, that unfree men could receive charters. Politico-economic rights have so far been granted in Lithuanian laws only to the nobility. Since many land grants contain rights given only to the nobility, it must follow,

according to the laws, that those receiving grants were nobles and therefore that the absence of the phrase "to him, his wife, children and future possible descendants eternally" did not mean that the recipient of a grant with that lack was not a freeman. It should be noted that boyars were permitted to assign to their wives only dotal property according to Article VII of the Privilege of 1413, a limitation which does not find substantiation in the land grants. That limitation might have come into conflict with a contrary Russian practice, resulting in the subordination of Article VII to traditional practice.

The right to coats of arms and to heraldic insignia and the right to a parliament are additional rights which were not reflected in land grants.

The obligation of the nobility to perform military service is less clearly expressed in the Privilege of 1413 than in the land grants. In the latter there are specific obligations to assist in military campaigns.²¹ The obligation of military service is only implicit in the Horodlo Union, except insofar as the lower nobles were obliged to construct fortifications and military roads. A reasonable explanation of the difference might be that Vitovt was eager to obtain traditional military service and thus attempted to exact it whenever that was feasible, i.e., when he made a grant of land to a lesser noble, but that Vitovt, in his quest for power, did not believe that he was in a position to enforce military service of all. The general obligations of serving and being faithful to the Christian faith and of remaining loyal to "us and our successors" probably imply, however, the obligation to perform military service, and may represent an attempt to lay the groundwork for the explicit reaffirmation by Vitovt or his successors of the great prince's right to military service.

The second part of the Horodlo Union of 1413 is a pledge on the part of the nobility of Lithuania to aid the Poles in any adversity against any enemy, to adhere to Poland, and not to elect any person as successor to Vitovt without the advice of Jagailo or his successor, and the advice of the prelates and of the nobility of Poland, with the understanding that the Polish nobility will do likewise.²² In conformity with the last stipulation, Vladislav III, King of Poland, accepted Sigismund as Great Prince of Lithuania in 1438.²³

The next significant law is the Privilege of 1434. The motive for this law seems to have been to quiet the Lithuanian or Russian nobles of Orthodox persuasion who supported Svidrigailo in his struggle with Sigismund and to win those nobles to Sigismund's side. Before examining the Privilege of 1434 it might be wise to take note of two related documents which preceded that Privilege.

One of these is the Privilege of 1432 by Jagailo, granting to the nobles of Lithuania the same rights whether they be Orthodox or Catholic. Those rights included the right of inheritance, the rights of assembling, commuting, or giving or converting property to their own uses. The Privilege insists upon the obligation of participating in the construction and repair of castles, in the construction of military roads, and in the furnishing of foods, presumably for armies of Lithuania which might pass through the territories of the nobles. Furthermore, it promises that all nobles, Orthodox or Catholic, are to enjoy the same privilege of bearing the coats of arms and insignia of the Polish nobility as had already been granted the nobility of Lithuania in the narrow sense in 1413.²⁴ This document never came into force, but is important as revealing the attitude of Jagailo in 1432 and as a precursor of the Privilege of 1434.

The other document is a charter from Jagailo to the city and land of Lutsk in

which he granted to princes, boyars, barons, and nobles, whether of the Latin or Eastern Rite, the rights and privileges which were enjoyed by the same groups in Poland. He promised not to destroy any churches of the Orthodox faith.²⁵ These two documents clearly establish the desire to place Russian nobles on the same plane as Lithuanian nobles.

The establishment of equality was accomplished by the Privilege of 1434. That Privilege was granted to all the princes and boyars of the Lithuanian and Russian parts of the Lithuanian-Russian state. It contains the following provisions: (1) no person was to be tried and punished in secret; (2) all hereditary goods were to be treated in the same manner as they were treated in all Christendom; (3) a widow was permitted to remain on her deceased husband's lands without any diminution of services to be rendered as a result of holding those lands, but in the event of her remarriage the goods and lands were to be handed over to the legitimate descendants of the deceased husband, either to his children or, if there were no children, to his brother or brothers; (4) all grants given by Vitovt were reconfirmed; (5) the peasants and vassals of princes and boyars were freed from paying the great prince the *diakla*, which consisted in tributes in kind, generally of grains; the *diakla*, as a result, fell to the princes and boyars; (6) princes and boyars were held responsible for the building and repairing of castles at their own expense; (7) the princes and boyars of the Russian part of Lithuania were granted the same rights to bear the coats of arms or insignia of the nobility of Poland as the Lithuanians possessed; and (8) it confirmed the conditions under which Vitovt granted privileges to the churches, princes, and boyars of "our" land.²⁶ It is interesting to note that the same rights of a political and economic nature which appeared in charters of Vitovt appeared in those of Svidrigailo, namely, of ownership, disposition, and improvement. In this respect the Privilege of 1434 does not represent any innovation. Its major innovation is the grant of the peasants' *diakla* to the princes and boyars. That provision is reflected in only one grant of Svidrigailo.²⁷ Re-emphasis (in the article dealing with widows) on the necessity of performing services in order to remain in continued possession of the land suggests that such services were not always being performed. All in all, the Privilege of 1434 shows that conditions of land tenure were not changing rapidly. Its real importance lies in the fact that it permitted Orthodox-Russian princes and boyars of Lithuania the same privileges as Catholic-Lithuanian princes and boyars of Lithuania—an attempt to strengthen Lithuania, and to check internal tensions. Possibly this Privilege reflected the desire for reunion between the Eastern and Western churches; however, because it was issued during the struggle between Svidrigailo and Sigismund for control of Lithuania, clearly it was a bid for the support of the Orthodox element within the Lithuanian-Russian state. There is some argument whether or not the Privilege was applicable to all of the Lithuanian-Russian land or merely to some of it. Liubavsky has suggested that the term Lithuania, as used in this document, is to be understood in the narrow sense as referring to Lithuania proper, i.e., the area around Vilna and Troki, and that at least Polotsk, Smolensk, and Kiev were not included in the area which was covered by the Privilege. However, the tendency of many nobles in these areas—Smolensk, Polotsk, and Kiev—to exercise the same privileges as those in Lithuania in the narrow sense seems to defeat this suggestion.²⁹

The next significant law which granted rights to the nobility of Lithuania was the Privilege of 1447 of Casimir, King-elect of Poland and Great Prince of Lithu-

ania.³⁰ The tone of this document is different from that of the Privilege of 1387 or of the Horodlo Union of 1413. Whereas the last two specified the goal of increasing the power of the Catholic Church as their *raison d'être*, this Privilege has no avowed goal. Its goal is nevertheless clear. It was an attempt to satisfy a disgruntled Lithuanian nobility. The introductory remarks suggest that Casimir had been moved to grant the Privilege because of the steadfastness of the faith of the nobility of Lithuania, Russia, and Samogitia. The nature of that faith, whether Catholic or Orthodox, does not seem to have been significant. The word "Catholic" does not appear. Since it did not appear, Casimir probably did not wish it to appear, possibly because the word was not pleasing to the entire nobility of the Great Principality of Lithuania in the year 1447. The final substantive article³¹ of the Privilege promises that no lands or offices will be granted to foreigners. That promise gives rise to the suspicion that Lithuania had seen foreigners as officeholders—and who would they be but Catholics, since the most likely foreigners to enter Lithuanian service were Poles, bound to Lithuania by past agreements? Grants to Poles and possibly to Germans and Tatars may have been a source of discontent. Another source of dissatisfaction on the part of the nobles might have been the failure of Lithuanian rulers to protect nobles' lands, because, for the first time, a Lithuanian ruler saw fit to promise to protect and to maintain his realm (Article XIII).

The Catholic church, however, did not lose its support from the ruler of Lithuania. Its grants, privileges, and liberties were the first to be guaranteed, and Casimir promised to fill ecclesiastical vacancies with persons of good character, and—without a doubt as a concession to dissatisfaction—with natives of the Great Principality, whenever possible (Article II).

Casimir confirmed the rights of the dukes, barons, nobles, citizens, and probably boyars as well, to their patrimonies or to grants made them by Vitovt or Sigismund,—rights such as the nobility of Poland enjoyed.³² Implicit was (1) the right of ownership, amplified by the guarantee of no interference by great-princely agents. Explicit were (2) rights of disposition—selling, exchanging, transferring by sale, and giving, and (3) rights of improvement—converting to the individual's own uses (*Beneplacitos*) (Article VI). Further protection was proffered to the nobility by prohibiting any heir to alienate the property of his or her deceased father to the detriment of his or her own heirs (Article VII); by guaranteeing a widow the right to remain on the estate of her former husband unless she remarried, in which case the estate remained in the hands of blood-heirs, except for such gifts from her husband as she might be able to prove (Article VIII); and by guaranteeing the right of women to be heirs as long as they remained in the Catholic fold (Article IX).

Closely allied to rights of landowning were rights over vassals on the land. To strengthen the position of the nobility, Casimir promised that neither he nor his officials would accept vassals (*homines obnoxios, tributarios, kmethones et il-liberos*) of others as their own, and he insisted that the prelates and the nobles should conduct themselves in like fashion (Article XI). The nobles were promised the right to collect from the peasants the *serebshchina*, or tribute in money, and the right to retain it. This meant that they had much greater control over the peasants. The same applied to various services which the peasants previously had been accustomed to rendering the great prince. The nobles received a renewal of the exception from furnishing the great prince with the *diakla*, or

tributes in kind, a right which had already been granted in the Privilege of 1434 (Article X).

The nobility also received a renewal of permission to join in foreign military campaigns as long as they did not neglect their service to Casimir (Article V).

The nobles were granted protection of their persons. Casimir promised "not to punish as the result of any denunciation in public or in secret, or of any other suspicion, nor to mete out any reprimand, alienation of goods, imprisonment, or financial or physical punishment without public trial in the presence of accusers according to the custom of Catholic law," and to make the punishment fit the crime (Article III). He defined a criminal as "he who shall have been a participant in a crime" and thus prohibited any transfer of guilt, e.g., a wife's being punished for her husband's crime, or a father, for his son's and vice versa, or any person, for his relative's or his servant's crime, except in cases of treason (Article IV).

In exchange for all these rights the noble had to accept obligations. He was specifically exempted from all obligations not mentioned. Besides a few minor duties, the obligations imposed were the furnishing of labor for the building of and repairing of fortifications, bridges, and roads, supplying guards, collecting tolls (Article X). It is interesting to note that widows were not compelled to perform service as in the Privilege of 1434, if they wished to retain control of lands. It would be incorrect to arrive at the conclusion that widows were exempt from this obligation, for it reappeared in 1492. Although Casimir had granted to the nobility freedom from the interference of his agents, he seemed concerned to maintain justice and so insisted that his "ministeriales" could be sent in for the purpose of investigating specific cases of injustice (Article XII).

The land grants tell a different story from that told by the Privilege of 1447.³⁴ In the period when Svidrigailo made grants, 1430-52, rights of improvement or formulations thereof were increasing. The additional rights mentioned in that category were "to expand," "to increase," "to settle," and "to use virgin soil." With the exception of the rights of settling, Casimir in his land grants seemed to have adopted those rights introduced by Svidrigailo. Yet none of the rights appeared in the laws. It might be reasonable to assume that the laws lagged behind practice. The increase in rights granted was concentrated primarily in Volynia, in the provinces of Lutsk, Zhitomir, and Vladimir, that is, in areas under Svidrigailo and nearer Poland. That increase may have been a response to the desire of local nobles for more power, which Svidrigailo sought to fulfill in order to secure their continued support. The nature of that increase may reflect the partial introduction of Polish practice in conformity with the guarantee that Polish and Lithuanian nobles were to enjoy the same rights.

In the land grants judicial rights appeared—judging alone and judging together with a prince or his agent. In the Privilege of 1447 those rights are not emphasized; instead Casimir mentioned that the only occasion when he or his agents could interfere in the judicial rights of the nobility was for the purpose of rectifying injustice. The sense of Casimir's stipulation may be the same as the insistence in some land grants that the great prince had the right to assist in judging. Perhaps in the Privilege the Great Prince had to limit himself because of a strong tendency toward judicial immunity farther east, but in specific grants to nobles in the east he was trying to exert his influence much more strongly than he dared to insist in the laws. The presence of many former *udel'nye* princes in Lithuania may have limited Casimir's ability to control the judicial system, for

those princes would have been accustomed to relative independence in judicial matters.

Freedom from the obligation to perform military service, first mentioned in grants dated 1488,³⁵ finds no counterpart in the laws or privileges, but the obligation to do military service is implicit, not explicit.

In addition to these differences there are similarities: both land grants and privileges speak of rights of possession and of disposition in terms which are near equivalents; both are concerned with the problem of inheritance and attempt to ensure succession by heirs to the lands of a deceased father or relative; and both guarantee rights over the people on lands, labor rights, and revenue rights. Essentially the land grants and the Privilege of 1447 re-enforce each other.

On February 29, 1468, Casimir issued a *sudebnik* or code of laws which had as its primary purpose the clarification of criminal procedure in the courts of Lithuania. There is no trace of a suggestion that the code was to become the law of the land, but rather to become the great princes' law. It is possible, in view of the express right of the great prince to intervene in the event of injustice within the noble courts,³⁶ that Casimir hoped that the establishment of a code of specific laws might broaden the definition of injustice and allow him or his successors to intervene in the nobles' courts more frequently.

In contrast to the land grants the code was specific as to the circumstances under which a man of a noble was to be compelled to have recourse to great-princely courts. "Whatever man of ours accuses a man of a prince, of a pan or of a boyar, [the latter] must be sent to our placeholder or bailiff, who is placeholder or bailiff in his [the defendant's] *povet*, in order that there may be justice for our man [and] if it please the general court, the general court may both set the accused free and give the accused his due" (Article IX). "And be there people of a prince, of a pan or of a boyar seeking redress from our people, for that [there is] one court and one law before our placeholders and our bailiffs, where they rule, and our office holders must render justice to both sides" (Article X).³⁷

The code insisted that if someone wished to bring suit against a man of a prince, pan, or boyar, he should seek justice "before his lord" and not attempt to make use of the great-princely court (Article XI).³⁸ That provision bears great similarity to the provision in land grants that a noble may judge people within his patrimony or *votchina*.³⁹

On August 6, 1492, Alexander, Casimir's son and successor as Great Prince of Lithuania, issued a Privilege. That Privilege deals almost exclusively with the rights of nobles. Not one word is mentioned about union with Poland, an item also missing in Casimir's Privilege of 1447. Church privileges were unchanged,⁴⁰ except for the additional stipulation that secular law was not to be introduced by Alexander into the ecclesiastical courts (Article XXXI).⁴¹

Not only did every right appear which had appeared in the Privilege of 1447 (Articles I-XVII) but also almost twice as many new rights were included. Boyars were added to those whose vassals (*homines obnoxios, tributarios, kmetbones, et illiberos*) the great prince would not receive (Article XIII).⁴²

The new rights granted pertained first and foremost to the government of Lithuania. Legislation and foreign policy were to be determined with the advice of the council of Lithuanian nobles, or *rada*.⁴³ Governmental posts were not to be abolished, but were to be retained particularly in accordance with local custom and were to be filled by honest men who would receive promotion to the position

of *voevoda* on the advice of the nobles. These same nobles were to have disposition of great-princely revenues.⁴⁴

Alexander strengthened land-holding rights by confirming Casimir's grants, by consenting to exemption from tributes, and by promising not to redeem lands to the disadvantage of potential heirs.⁴⁵ He improved the social and political rights of the nobility by promising never to place common men over nobles,⁴⁶ and extended the judicial rights of the nobility by insisting that they deserved justice free from the effects of accusation or favoritism, and by promising to hold court four times each year to hear serious inheritance disputes and cases involving a man's reputation, and to handle any cases not reached in one of those four courts at the earliest convenient opportunity, without prejudice to the rights of the litigants.⁴⁷

The services to be performed and the restrictions on rights mentioned in the Privilege of 1447 were repeated in this charter, with the addition of two clauses pertaining to women: (1) that a widow must perform service if she continued to hold her deceased husband's land⁴⁸ and (2) that an unmarried woman or widow who married outside of Lithuania would lose her inheritance rights.⁴⁹

Alexander may have attempted to pave the way for the use of foreign personnel in the Lithuanian official hierarchy, for, although he repeated the promise of the Privilege of 1447 to use only natives in posts within his service, he neglected to repeat the stipulation that that promise would be binding upon his successors.⁵⁰

The trend toward expansion of rights in the laws runs parallel to the expansion of rights in the land grants, but the specific new rights granted are not mentioned in any land grants.

Rights repeated from the Privilege of 1447 differ somewhat from the rights granted in the land grants. The right of the nobles to judge did not appear to be part of the normal complement of rights granted by the great prince in the land grants,⁵¹ yet it does appear normal in the Privileges. There are two likely reasons for the fact that some nobles did receive the right of judging. (1) In parts of Lithuania, especially in the east, among the princes, the right of judging was considered to be an intrinsic part of princes' rights and consequently was granted to eastern princes. (2) In the west Casimir was complying with the promise that the Lithuanian nobility have the rights enjoyed by the Polish nobility, yet the basic policy of the Great Prince was probably aimed at reducing the judicial power of the nobles. Article XII of the Privilege of 1447 covers the rights of the Great Prince of Lithuania to intervene in the judicial affairs of the nobility, "And if they . . . do not do justice, then our *ministeriales* . . . ought to be sent . . . and they must atone to no other."⁵² What is involved, then, is both affirmation of the right of nobles to judge and a limitation on the finality of a judicial determination by a noble. On the one hand, the former *udel'nye* princes, now nobles of Lithuanian Russia, probably thought they had exclusive judicial power. The effort of the ruler to reduce their exercise of that right by retaining in the hands of the central government the power of review, so as to assure justice, may be regarded as a check on the Orthodox princes in favor of the people living under them. Those princes might be expected to resent such a curtailment of their prerogatives. On the other hand, granting a general right of judging was an extension of the rights of those nobles who had not previously exercised judicial power, and such nobles might have been well pleased.

The political rights with economic implications mentioned in the land grants

and in the Privileges were the same, except that there was a tendency in the land grants to restrict the right of disposition in lands to the east.⁵³ Since the restriction did not occur after 1450, it might be concluded that mention in the Privileges of that right is adequate proof that it was at no time actually denied a landholder after 1450. It was noted earlier that prohibitions of that right occurred only in grants to nobles without princely titles. It may be concluded that the great princes were not anxious to forfeit rights when they granted lands and only did so when that right became the universal possession of the nobility.

Military service is a much thornier problem. Earlier grants contained specific evidence of the obligation to perform such service when land was granted with a condition of service. That obligation was apparently losing ground in Lithuania. There is a specific grant dated 1494 which endows the holder with freedom from the obligation to campaign.⁵⁴ Since it is an unusual right, the document requires specific examination. It was granted by Alexander, Great Prince of Lithuania, to Feodor Ludov, who, because he appeared without title, may be considered one of the boyars. Feodor received the post of city elder in the urban districts of Vladimir and Lutovizh, with the privileges and revenues pertaining to that post, but he was exempt from military campaigns. Because he was exempt and because such an exemption for the holder of a life post was rare, we may assume (1) that the post of city elder normally carried with it the obligation to perform military service or (2) that the post of city elder of Vladimir and Lutovizh normally carried with it the obligation to perform military service. In either case the exemption from military service would indicate a relaxation of duties in favor of the nobility. In neither case would that exemption upset the basic assumption that military service was required of the nobility, even though it is at most implied in Article VII.⁵⁵

Other rights present in the grants and in the Privileges are complementary. Certain additional duties mentioned in the Privileges are not mentioned or were merely implicit in the grants. They were the building and restoration of necessary castles, the performance of offices, and customary prescriptions (or guard duty), the payment of contributions, the erection and repair of bridges, and the reconstruction of roads.⁵⁶

A glance at the Samogitian Privilege of 1492 is rewarding, not because one may assume that rights granted to the Samogitian nobility may be equated with rights held by the West Russian nobility, but rather because it reveals more about the mental outlook of Alexander. The Privilege exhibits a greater preoccupation with the rights of the nobles. The noble class is offered protection against interlopers: ". . . whoever were nobles in the time of King Vladislav [Jagailo] or of Great Prince Vitovt and of our father, all those we will regard henceforth as nobles." The same statement was made in regard to serving people (Article XII).⁵⁷ That article seems to point up a trend similar to one which had already emerged in Poland, the closing of the ranks of the nobility to newcomers, as a prerequisite to the struggle for increased rights by the nobles and the eventual formation of the *Respublica Poloniae*. The rights of the nobles in local affairs were greatly strengthened, Alexander committing himself to send only those officials desired or elected by the Samogitian nobility and to establish no new offices.⁵⁸ Alexander promised personal protection to the nobility and freedom from the obligations to work on castles and to perform military service.⁵⁹ All of these rights—protection of class status, control over choice of local officials, pro-

tection of person, and freedom from certain duties—placed the Samogitian noble in a position of greater security than the average Lithuanian-Russian noble, and show that the Samogitian noble enjoyed additional rights, as did the nobles of Polotsk and Vitebsk. It indicates the existence of a force working against centralization and inequality in the treatment of nobles.

During the reign of Alexander the idea of union between Poland and Lithuania again occupied an important place in the thinking of the nobles of Lithuania. In 1496 a project for renewing the Horodlo Union was drawn up. It is interesting to note that the project did not contain all parts of the Horodlo Union, and that it left out those sections dealing with the Orthodox. It specified only that certain nobles would have the right to bear the coats of arm and insignia as in Poland, that the Lithuanians would treat the Poles as allies and help them against any enemy, and that the Poles would reciprocate. Finally it provided that the Lithuanians would elect a Lithuanian ruler from the Lithuanian-Polish royal house and that the Poles would do the same. This last provision represents a change: for the first time, the idea of electing a ruler from the same family is suggested as part of the law.⁶⁰ Although this document did not become a law, it paved the way for the appointment of Martin, Bishop of Samogitia, and Ian Zaberezinsky as envoys to Poland in 1499 for the purpose of considering drawing up a new act of union.⁶¹ This mission was the expression of the will of the upper nobility of Lithuania which had met in a general convention, July, 1499, and had there declared its desire to reinstitute the union, with specific emphasis upon the provision that the Lithuanians would elect no ruler without the advice and knowledge of the Poles and that the Poles would similarly consult Lithuanians.⁶² That eventually led to the formulation of more specific proposals by Alexander in 1501. Not only did he provide for common advice and common help in time of trouble (Articles V and VI), which was probably a reaction to his difficulties with Moscow, but he also protested that members of the council, both secular and clerical, would be obliged to swear to support this union (Article XI).⁶³ Although these suggested conditions of union between Poland and Lithuania did not become law, nevertheless they point up the fact that Alexander was prepared to subordinate the rights of advisers on his great-princely council, as well as the rights of those who performed military service, to the necessity of swearing allegiance to both Poland and Lithuania. That requirement would undoubtedly have been obnoxious to the Russians living within the great principality of Lithuania, who desired to act as vassals of a separate state and not as vassals of part of Poland. Thus there was in Alexander's mind in 1501 the possibility of taking steps prejudicial to the interests of the Russian nobles of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

In 1506, on his accession to the thrones of Poland and Lithuania, Sigismund, son of Casimir and the brother of the recently deceased Alexander, issued Privileges to the nobles of Lithuania. In the fragments of those Privileges which are available he assured the nobles of certain politico-economic rights: (1) the right of the possession of *patromonia* and (2) the right of disposition—that is, the selling of such land.⁶⁴ As in Articles X and XI of the Privilege of 1492, women were allowed to inherit the land of nobles.⁶⁵ There are a number of articles which repeat earlier provisions. These articles lack some of the provisions which appeared in the Privilege of 1492—particularly those relative to widows and unmarried women. The lack should cause no surprise, because the

Privileges of 1506 are preserved only as a series of fragments; therefore, it would be unwarranted to assume that the Privileges of 1506 did not grant the same rights as that of 1492. The last articles tended to strengthen the power of the *rada* or the Great-Princely Council. The Great Prince obligated himself to retain all laws and make no changes without the approval of the council and to conduct the foreign policy of Lithuania with the advice and approval of the council.⁶⁶

Thus aside from the strengthening of the *rada*, the Privileges of 1506 add little. For that reason it will be unnecessary to compare them with the land grants which were issued during the period 1492-1514, for one would arrive at conclusions no different from those reached in comparing the Privilege of 1492 with the land grants of the same period.

CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing analysis of the Privileges has resulted in some conclusions about the position of the nobles of the Lithuanian-Russian state. The earlier analysis of the provisions of land grants produced somewhat different conclusions. It might be well to summarize here the results of a comparison of the two sets of conclusions.

During the entire period 1377-1514 the Privileges generally spelled out provisions at the same time as they appeared in land grants. The one possible significant exception is the right of disposition, which probably was conceded to all of the nobility in the Privilege of 1447. It appeared in land grants to lesser nobles or boyars, however, only after 1492.

Both Privileges and land grants reveal a substantial but uneven growth in the rights accorded the West Russian nobility. Up to the Privilege of 1434 both the land grants and Privileges confirm the fact that rights were reserved for Catholic nobles. Many of the West Russian nobles probably felt this reservation very little because their lands were loosely tied to the Lithuanian state.

The Privilege of 1434 was more important as a symbol of future developments than as an indication of immediate change. To be sure the Orthodox West Russian nobles now began to receive land grants as did Catholics. But very probably the acquisition of land grants, especially by Orthodox princes, was a mixed blessing representing as it did the subordination of the princes to the great princely government. Late in the reign of Casimir, and during that of Alexander, lesser West Russian nobles began to receive land grants containing a larger number of rights. Only then was the promise of 1434 a reality. Not only the Orthodox nobility but also the Catholic nobility benefited from the increase in rights granted by the Privilege of 1434 and land grants after 1434, a fact which probably did not please either the Orthodox or Catholic princes who saw their relative power position decline.

On the one hand, the average Orthodox prince during the period 1434-92 was probably displeased not only with the above-mentioned emergence of the lesser nobility but also with the steady increase in power of governmental officials who received the bulk of the grants before 1492. The prince was probably annoyed too that the Privileges accorded him rights which were not always reflected in his land grants. If he lived in Smolensk, he could not have rejoiced over the increase in obligations.

On the other hand, he had good cause to be pleased. The Privileges mention exemptions from payment of tributes in kind and in money and from a few other duties. There were other economic advantages which the nobles received in land

grants, not mentioned in the Privileges. Obligations declined. Military service was not required specifically in any Privilege after that of 1413, although many services connected with war-making were mentioned repeatedly thereafter. The average prince enjoyed the right of disposing of his land as he saw fit. The Privileges from 1447 on contain that right, and the land grants show that he exercised it. (Those princes who had recently ruled autonomously or independently probably regarded the right of disposition as a right which had always been theirs and so may not have been pleased by its inclusion in the Privileges.)

In the period after 1492 the West Russian princes had an additional reason to be happy with their lot. Those who were neither Catholic nor members of the governmental hierarchy now had a far better chance of getting the rights which were conceded them by the Privileges. Practice almost caught up with theory. The land grants came much closer to reflecting the provisions of the Privileges.

But the increase in the power of the *rada* or council probably displeased them. The very governmental officials who had enjoyed the rights mentioned in the earlier Privileges now acquired not additional rights over land but greater influence in the government. The Privileges of 1492 and 1506 confirmed the power of the council. Since the council was composed mainly of Catholic nobles, the West Russian princes remained in an inferior position. Previously their inferiority had been the result of inequalities in grants of rights—inequalities not countenanced by the Privileges themselves. Now, when it appeared that those inequalities would be erased as the gap narrowed between the rights to land conceded by the Privileges and those actually enjoyed, the princes suffered political inequality on the central governmental level. To be sure, that inequality had been developing steadily since the fourteenth century, but it became more acute after 1492.

Prior to 1434 the lesser West Russian nobles, the boyars, were doubtless dissatisfied by their exclusion from the rights enjoyed by Catholic nobles. In the period 1434-92 they had many reasons to be pleased. In theory, at least, they now enjoyed the same rights as any other nobles. In practice they enjoyed the same exemptions as the princes and might well have exulted in the improvement of their position as the differentiation between princes and non-princes steadily lessened.

Marked differences remained. Although the Privileges probably granted them the right of disposition with the approval of the great prince, yet not until 1476 was that right used by any but a prince.⁶⁷ Even from 1476 to 1492, Catholic pans were the only non-princes who exercised that right. Furthermore, although, according to the Privileges, all nobles were eligible to receive land grants with equal rights, the overwhelming majority of land grants—especially those with lengthy lists of rights—were made to governmental officials most of whom were pans and Catholics.

After 1492 the lesser West Russian nobles had greater cause to rejoice. The Privilege of 1492 clearly granted them the right to dispose of land, and they actually began to receive that right in land grants after 1492. Restrictions generally declined in number, and a lesser noble needed no longer be a governmental official in order to have a good chance of receiving a land grant with a great number of rights. Finally, the lesser nobles saw that, on occasion at least, they were treated just as well as a prince, although to be sure the majority of the grants to lesser nobles still contained fewer rights.

The Privileges and land grants lead to the conclusion that the great princes of Lithuania followed policies which tended to produce one group of nobles equal as to the type of economic and political power which they exercised over their lands. Wide disparities continued, however, in the amount of power exercised by different individuals.

V. LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

Did local office-holding practices antagonize the West Russian nobility and help to convince them that they should desert Lithuania for Moscow? An answer to that question is the goal of this chapter. A chart is appended to this chapter so that the reader may compare the development of office-holding in different regions and the personnel holding office.¹

Why emphasize local practices? Why not consider the situation on the central governmental level? It must be remembered that M. K. Liubavsky has already supplied an answer to the question of what impact central governmental practices may have had.² He has shown that the overwhelming majority of officeholders in the central government were Catholic. The Privileges of 1387 and 1413 restricted to Catholics appointments to office by the great princes. Even the Privilege of 1434 with its promise of equal rights to Catholics and Orthodox hardly changed this state of affairs. To a large extent that lack of substantial change resulted from the fact that the Catholic pans had, during the early part of the fifteenth century, become the wealthiest landholders in the Lithuanian-Russian state; therefore they were able to demand a share in the exercise of state power in exchange for their support of the great princes, particularly in time of war. It would be reasonable to conclude that the Orthodox nobles were jealous of the wealth and power of the Catholic pans and were impelled by this jealousy to join Moscow. Such a conclusion is probably valid if it is limited to those nobles who associated with the Catholic pans and to those former autonomous princes who may have resented the usurpation by the central government of their power to make war and to conduct foreign affairs. To try to apply the conclusion to the average West Russian noble would be risky, for he was unlikely to have known about the extensive landholdings which were Catholic pans' principal sources of wealth unless he lived in the Russian areas within the governor-generalcies of Vilna and Troki, the only Lithuanian regions in which Russian nobles had numerous and substantial holdings.

A second reason for emphasizing local practices is that the most numerous points of contact between the central government and the West Russian nobles were at the local level. Lithuania, a centralized state early in the fourteenth century, became federalistic, less by design than because of the impossibility of rapidly digesting the vast territories which were conquered, and of remolding them so that their institutions would be identical with those of the central government. In spite of local traditions and privileges which the Lithuanian-Russian government recognized, self-rule, whether of the regional princes or of former autonomous princes, was giving way to the power of the central government. That power was exercised by local agents of the central government, who have been described in chapter II. It was those agents who competed with local princes and who, as they took over powers of the princes, enjoyed an increasing measure of control over the lesser nobles. Thus, in spite of the extension of nobles' rights through Privileges and land grants, there was a contrary tendency which worked toward the reduction of the nobles' powers. Therein lies a major paradox of fifteenth-century Lithuanian history. To be sure, the trend toward the extension of nobles' rights was destined to win out in the sixteenth century, but that was not clear during the period 1377-1514.

There were two major waves of desertion from Lithuania, 1379-1408 and

1481-1508. Since it is doubtful that the first wave resulted to any considerable extent from local office-holding practices, discussion of such practices will be aimed primarily at explaining the second, larger wave.

Office-holding developed little during the period 1377-1430. A glance at the chart of officeholders will reveal that during this period they appeared almost exclusively in the major cities. They appeared in the ten major political subdivisions as follows: (1) Vilna—Vilna, Oshmiany, and Krevo, (2) Troki—Troki, Kovno, Brest, and Gorodno, (3) Samogitia (without reference to any specific city except while Samogitia was under Prussian control, at which time potential administrators were probably limited to control of Mednik), (4) Volynia—Lutsk and Vladimir (and also Kremenets while it was under Polish control), (5) Podolia (without reference to any specific city), (6) Kiev—Kiev and Putivl', (7) Chernigov-Seversk—Trubchevsk, Chernigov, and Mtsensk, and the capital cities of the same names as the political subdivisions, (8) Smolensk, (9) Polotsk, and (10) Vitebsk. Prior to 1408 only five cities outside the primarily Lithuanian areas were regularly subject to officials of the central government—Trubchevsk, Putivl', Kiev, Lutsk, and Polotsk. In fact the central government controlled through its agents only Vilna, Troki, Kiev, Polotsk, and Volynia, five of the ten major subdivisions. To be sure, Vitebsk and Podolia were briefly in the hands of prefects in 1392 and 1393 respectively. Smolensk was under Lithuanian control for a few months in the summer of 1386, then again 1395-1401, and finally in 1404, when the independent princely family of Smolensk was ousted for good.

On the death of Olgerd in 1377 most of the lands of the Lithuanian-Russian state were in the hands of regional princes who were either sons of Olgerd or relatives of the ruling dynasty of Gedemin. Even the later governor-generalcy of Troki, part of the heartland of Lithuania proper, was in the hands of Olgerd's brother, Keistut, who was more like a regional prince than the co-ruler he has sometimes been called. Vitovt Keistutovich, who acted as Jagailo's viceroy, 1392-1401, in fact controlled the Lithuanian-Russian state almost alone, both during that period and 1401-30, when he was a virtually independent great prince.³ He abolished almost all of the regional principalities. In his bid for power he seized Lutsk from Prince Feodor Danilovich Ostrozhsky in 1387. When he came to power in 1392, he gained nominal control over all Volynia, seizing Vladimir in 1393 and Kremenets in 1396 or 1397, only to lose both these cities to Polish appointees of Jagailo. He took Podolia from Feodor Koriatovich in 1393, was obliged to surrender it to Jagailo, but regained it in 1410. He acquired Troki and Polotsk, 1395, and Vitebsk, 1408. Kiev had a regional prince until 1397, Trubchevsk to 1392, Chernigov to at least 1408, Mtsensk possibly until 1423, and Briansk throughout Vitovt's reign. Muscovite acquisition of Liubutsk on Svidrigailo's defection in 1408 put an end to control of that town by regional princes. A few regional princes, as, for instance, those of Pinsk and Briansk, remained, and in 1420 at the latest Vitovt was obliged to re-establish Svidrigailo Olgerdovich as a regional prince with control of Trubchevsk and a few other localities.

Vitovt did not oust all independent, local princely families, as he did in Smolensk in 1404. Most of the heads of such families became autonomous princes who recognized Vitovt as their overlord. Vitovt may even have re-established Prince Roman Mikhailovich Briansky in control of Briansk, from 1393 until his death in 1401. Muscovite acquisition of Kozel'sk in 1410 put an end to inde-

pendent local rule in that town. Apparently when local princes regained control of Kozel'sk, they became autonomous princes within the Lithuanian-Russian state.

A halfway step by Vitovt was the appointment of a few members of the Gedeminovich family as holders of a *votchina* or *patrimonium*. They did not enjoy independence or even the full measure of control normal among regional princes. Instead they were more like autonomous local princes, except that the great prince determined whether their sons would succeed them. In that category were Prince Aleksandr Patrikeevich of Starodub, in his capacity as prince of Briansk from 1401 to at least 1406, and Prince Ivan Olgimuntovich Gol'shansky, in his capacity as prince and *voevoda* of Kiev for probably a decade after 1397.

On Vitovt's death in 1430, Svidrigailo Olgerdovich was elected Great Prince of Lithuania by dissatisfied Lithuanian nobles and by Russian princes and boyars, many of whom may have resented both the policy of centralization of the Lithuanian government and the policy of support of the Catholic Church which Vitovt had vigorously pursued. Svidrigailo, a leader of great capacity, had inspired a revolt in 1408 of princes holding land in Chernigov-Seversk. He attempted to promote Muscovite hegemony over this area during Muscovite Lithuanian hostilities but failed because of the reconciliation of the reigning Great Prince of Moscow, Vasili I, Vitovt's son-in-law, and Vitovt himself. Returning to Lithuania, Svidrigailo was clamped into jail, where he remained until his release in 1419. Such was his popularity that Vitovt felt constrained to make him a regional prince in Chernigov-Seversk. Svidrigailo's election as Great Prince resulted in the introduction of local officials in those parts of Chernigov-Seversk which he had previously held. His first appointment in this area was that of Pan Iuri Ivanovich, as prefect of Briansk. Pan Iuri may well have been the first Orthodox official in Lithuania. The first recorded prefect of Trubchevsk, Petrash Montygirdovich, was appointed by Svidrigailo. The latter also appointed Prince Piotr Nesvitsky as first Lithuanian prefect of Kremenets or allowed him to control that city until Poles seized it in 1434.

Svidrigailo's conduct in office, in particular his anti-Polish and pro-Orthodox orientation, was the immediate cause of a civil war which lasted from 1432 to 1437. As a result of that civil war, Svidrigailo was ousted from his position as Great Prince of Lithuania and went into exile in Poland. A second result was the entrenchment of Sigismund Keistutovich as Great Prince of Lithuania and the promotion of a policy of centralization. That policy became directed against the nobility, some of whom, fearing for their lives, discussed how best to thwart Sigismund. The solution was provided by Alexander Iur'evich Czartoryski and his brother Ivan, princes of normally co-operative Volynia, when they assassinated Sigismund in 1440. The legacy of Sigismund's reign was local upheaval, especially in those lands which were less thoroughly subjected to the Lithuanian bureaucracy.

Local disturbances may have helped Svidrigailo regain control of Volynia and part of Podolia. His control, probably during the years 1442-52, was a check to the growth of the central governmental bureaucracy in those regions. Local officials were responsible to Svidrigailo. Because of Svidrigailo's presence, fewer important local officials were necessary, the reins of government being firmly in Svidrigailo's hands.

Local upheaval was a significant problem during the period 1440-46 also in Smolensk, Polotsk, Samogitia, and probably Kiev, and may have helped to

produce the tendency to place Gedeminovichi in control again, but not as regional princes as formerly. In Smolensk there was a famine in the years 1436-38, which in conjunction with the repressive measures of Sigismund may have been responsible for the overthrow in 1440 of Andrei Iuchkovich Sakovich, prefect of Smolensk. The people of Smolensk elected Prince Andrei Dmitrievich Dorogobuzhsky, a local prince, as their governor-general, but shortly substituted, in his place, a Gedeminovich, Prince Iuri Semionovich (Lingven) Mstislavsky, ruler of Mstislavl', a principality which had been torn out of the principality of Smolensk and given to his father, Prince Semion Olgerdovich. Prince Iuri's ambitions led him to cast covetous eyes on Polotsk and plan its conquest. Perhaps fearing further war, the Smolensk people threw him out, thereby facilitating the return to power in Smolensk of agents of the Lithuanian government. The fact that Iuri could entertain hopes of adding Polotsk to his growing domain argues for dissatisfaction in Polotsk. Had Lithuanian officials been firmly entrenched, he would hardly have dreamed of conquering that city.

Samogitians supported Prince Mikhailo Sigismundovich in his effort to secure his late father's throne in 1440. The Lithuanian governor-general (administrator), Kezgailo Volimuntovich, was thrown out of office and was replaced by Kontovtov Dovmont. Supporters of Casimir, Great Prince of Lithuania, probably regained control of Samogitia in 1442, when Kezgailo resumed his position as governor-general, to which he had never officially given up the title.

Certain developments suggest the possibility of local upheaval in Kiev. (1) In 1440 Casimir saw fit to allow Kiev its own Orthodox prince, Olel'ko Vladimirovich, instead of continuing the succession of governors-general of whose existence there is no evidence after the period 1397-1437, and (2) during 1442-43 Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich was able to conquer Kiev, with the assistance of Vasilii II of Moscow. Clearly, the first development indicates that Casimir did not believe he could retain control of Kiev without the help of a prince who would appeal to the Kievans. Since fear of the ambitions of Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich to secure the throne of the Lithuanian-Russian state greatly affected Casimir in the forties (he postponed accepting the throne of Poland and going to be crowned until he was sure that Prince Mikhail was no longer a threat), it is conceivable that already in 1440 he feared a group of Kievans who were favorable to Prince Mikhail and that the appointment of Prince Olel'ko was an attempt to counterbalance the influence of that group. If that is true, then it is possible that Prince Mikhail's conquest of Kiev resulted in part from support from within.

In addition to the just-discussed tendency toward local revolt, there was another centrifugal force which tended to weaken the control of the central government—the grant of areas to princes. In 1439-45 the Muslim, Achi-Girei, a princeling of the Horde, held Oshmiany in Vilna as an *otchina*—that is, as his own estate or territory to rule with an independence similar to that enjoyed by the regional princes in the early years of Vitovt's reign. In 1440 Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich, a Catholic, received Bel'sk, Briansk, and Serezh in Podliash'e, Kletsk and Koidanov in Vilna, and Briansk and Starodub in Chernigov-Seversk, perhaps as a vain bribe to try to prevent his attempting to secure the throne of the Lithuanian-Russian state. In that same year Prince Iuri Semionovich (Lingven) Mstislavsky, an Orthodox opponent of the late Great Prince Sigismund Keistutovich, received Krichov, as a new *otchina*, and was reinstated in his former *otchina*, Mstislavl'. That he was granted those lands indicates weakness of the central

government, a disregard of the religious preference of the grantee-prince, and an emphasis upon any steps calculated to gain support for Casimir. Apparently the grants were not enough to prevent the newly returned exile from working against Casimir as the above discussion of Smolensk indicates. As a result Prince Iuri appears to have lost control of Krichov in 1442 along with the loss of control of Smolensk. None of the above grants seems to demonstrate a desire on the part of the Lithuanian government to get along with the lesser nobles. Rather, they show an effort to please more powerful local nobles or Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich, a potential competitor for the Lithuanian throne.

The lesser nobles, who held posts, however, may have been pleased by the increase in local offices, resulting from the emergence of Kletsk, Kremenets, and Radun as seats of agents of the central government. Non-office-holding nobles might, however, have been offended. The offended nobles would have been Russians or Lithuanians of Vilna and Volynia.

By and large not only the policy of Svidrigailo as Great Prince of Lithuania, 1430-37, and as a quasi-independent ruler of large areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state, 1442-52, but also the policy of Casimir during the early part of his reign, 1440-52, was aimed at calming the nobility, and at relieving them of their fears that the policy of centralization pursued by Vitovt, 1392-1430, and by his brother Sigismund Keistutovich during the years 1437-40, would continue.

Therefore it is no surprise to discover that Svidrigailo's appointment of Orthodox officeholders in the early years of his reign as great prince was followed by his appointment of other Orthodox officials in Kamenets, Lutsk, Kremenets, and Bratslav, in Podolia and Volynia. It is also no surprise that Casimir appointed Orthodox officials. An exception is to be found in Casimir's appointment of Catholics in Smolensk. He permitted Andrei Sakovich, his predecessor's appointee, to remain in office in 1440. To be sure, Andrei Sakovich was soon thrown out. When the Lithuanian government regained control of Smolensk, trusted Catholic officials may well have taken over, for Sen'ko Gedigoldovich was prefect in 1451, and the following year his brother Mikhail succeeded him.

In sum, the period 1430-52 witnessed only a modest growth in the number of local governmental officials (especially when compared with the reign of Vitovt), the introduction of Orthodox officials, and a general relaxation of control over several areas of the Lithuanian-Russian State—developments hardly calculated to antagonize the nobility of that state.

From 1452 to 1492 an increase in the number of local posts took place. That increase took the forms of (1) the creation of new posts and (2) the resurrection of old posts.

New posts were generally those of prefects in outlying areas and in lesser cities in the east, in Kiev and Chernigov-Seversk, and in the west in Podolia. In 1476 Putivl' apparently acquired its first prefect. Kozel'sk may have acquired a prefect in 1447; Liubutsk, in 1467; Ovruch', in 1478; Zviagol', Zhitomir, and Chernigov, in 1488; Vynitsa, in the eighties; and Braslavl', around 1490.

New posts sometimes represented less important jobs in major cities. A treasurer appears for Smolensk in 1481 and an *okol'nichii* in 1482. A *mytnik* appears for Kiev in 1488.

Old posts were re-established in areas which had been under the control of princes as *patrimonia* and in areas which had revolted from the government of Lithuania during the early forties. Thus Kiev again had a governor-general in

1471 after the death of Prince Semion Olel'kovich; Smolensk had a prefect again in 1450 or perhaps earlier, after local revolt had been suppressed; Samogitia returned to the control of a Lithuanian administrator in the 40's. Volynia under the control of Svidrigailo, 1442-52, witnessed the return of Lithuanian appointees to local posts in almost all cities except Kremenets, which with a part of eastern Volynia, passed under the control of princes of Kiev. Consequently, until after the death of Prince Semion Olel'kovich, no Lithuanian prefect appears, possibly as late as 1475. A Lithuanian prefect was re-established in the Podolian town of Kamenets in 1454, after Svidrigailo's death. In Chernigov-Seversk, Briansk again had a prefect in 1486; Mtsensk, in 1467.

It is evident from the above that the greatest increase in local officials took place in the Russian lands of the Lithuanian-Russian state. Furthermore that increase generally occurred in the later part of the reign of Casimir, particularly after the re-establishment of direct control over Kiev in 1471. Although all Russian lands except Polotsk were affected, the Russian lands in the east seem to have witnessed the creation of more new posts than other areas. Indeed except for officials of Smolensk and Kiev, all local officials appear in the east for the first time, during the reign of Casimir. That was probably because other areas generally already had local officials representing the central government.

The increase in local officials tended to coincide with the rise in disturbances in the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state, especially in the eighties. Those disturbances may well have resulted in part from the establishment of new posts. Boyars, unaccustomed to the presence of agents of the Lithuanian government, probably resented the consequent reduction in their authority.

Another source of antagonism may have been the fact that from 1452 to 1492 Catholic officials tend to predominate throughout the Lithuanian-Russian state, but their predominance was much less noticeable in the Russian Orthodox areas than it was in the Lithuanian Catholic areas. That tendency was greater in the second half of the period. Furthermore, while in the first half many of these central governmental agents were drawn from the local population, in the second half the importation of Catholic officials from a different region became a frequent practice, especially in the Russian areas. Some imported officials were Pan Piotr Ivanovich Montygirdovich, governor-general of Lutsk, and marshal of the Volynia land 1486-90, Pan Mikolai Radivil, governor-general of Smolensk 1475-86, and Iuri Patsovich, governor-general of Kiev 1486-89.

In all likelihood the efforts of the Lithuanian government to strengthen its hold over areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state was a greater source of dissatisfaction than the dominance and importation of Catholic officials. For the increase in the number of posts was widespread, whereas the effect of the importation of Catholic officials was tempered by the appointment of local Orthodox nobles as officials.

The impact of the importation of Catholic officials was probably offset in certain areas by the presence of Orthodox officials. The area of Chernigov-Seversk had several prefects before 1492 who may have been or who definitely were Orthodox—for example, the prefects of Chernigov, Briansk, Liubutsk—namely, Trubetskois, Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich, and others. Smolensk had local officials who were clearly Orthodox before 1492—the treasurers of Smolensk, the Kroshinskys. In Volynia Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich, an Orthodox, was *gorodnichii* of Lutsk. There was one major official of Kremenets before 1492

who was Orthodox, Prince Semion Vasilievich Zbarazhsky. Vitebsk probably had a Catholic administrator, Pan Piotr Leliush, in 1452, but thereafter through 1492 had only Orthodox officials.

Probably among reasons for desertion in the period 1492-1514 was the increase in the number of local officials. That increase is evident in the areas of Troki, Vilna, Samogitia, and Polotsk. Eleven officials appear in the period through the death of Vitovt. Two appear between 1430 and 1452. Twelve appear from 1452 to 1492; however, only one of those appears before 1471 and half of them appear during the 1480's. In the fourth period, from 1492 to 1513, thirty-two posts are named in the documents. That means, then, that 55 per cent of all local posts appear for the first time from 1492 onward, and 77 per cent appear from 1471 onward. That circumstance would argue that a change in policy had taken place inside the Lithuanian-Russian state. Probably local officials were being appointed in increasing numbers to collect dues and tributes which were becoming increasingly sorely needed, to manage properly the estates of the Great Prince of Lithuania, and to collect the revenues therefrom. It is possible but unlikely that this pattern is merely a reflection of the paucity of documents from the early fifteenth century. It seems likely that the Great Prince of Lithuania was attempting to secure his power by the appointment of a larger number of local officials at the same time that he was weakening his power through the grant of various economic exemptions and various rights and privileges as discussed in the chapter on the Privileges.

New posts appeared in Russian areas which had been under direct Lithuanian control for a shorter time than the areas just discussed. In Smolensk, Luchino first had a prefect in 1495; in Chernigov-Seversk, Liubech, in 1508; in Kiev, Cherkassy, in 1494, Mozyr, in 1506, Krasnosel'sk, in 1492; and in Vitebsk, Drutsk, in 1502.

The dissatisfaction which Russian nobles may have felt because of the increase in the number of local officials may have been offset by the fact that a larger number of Orthodox were appointed to local offices than ever before. Indeed, even the proportion of Orthodox appointees was larger than it had ever been. In the heartland of Lithuania, the governor-generalcies of Troki and Vilna, and in the two adjacent areas of Samogitia and Polotsk, Catholic officials pre-empted almost all the local offices not only in the period before 1430 or 1434 but also thereafter to 1514. The exceptions, those who may clearly be identified as Orthodox, appear in most of the above areas from 1502 on—Ivan Bogdanovich Sopega, *gorodnichii* of Troki 1511, his uncle Ivan Sopega, prefect of Zhizhmory, 1502-06, Pan Bogush Bogovitinovich, prefect of Prelai 1500-03 and of Zhizhmory, 1509, and of Dovkchi 1509-14, Prince Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky, prefect of Ros' 1502-14 and of Obolitsy 1502-08, and Prince Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy, pan of Vilna from 1511 on. In the area of Minsk, however, Orthodox officials seem to have been the rule before 1502. To be sure, aside from the Orthodox appointees themselves most Orthodox nobles may not have been aware of the above-mentioned increases in the governor-generalcies of Troki and Vilna and in Samogitia, since those areas were inhabited largely by Catholics, and the appointments were generally to posts in predominantly Catholic districts. But Orthodox nobles who lived in Russian areas, like Minsk in the governor-generalcy of Vilna, and the entire governor-generalcy of Polotsk, probably knew of the

above-mentioned increases in the number and proportions of Orthodox appointees within their own regions.

In the Russian regions of the east and of the south, Orthodox appointees were the rule not only in all of the cities in the Chernigov-Seversk region, in Podolia and in Volynia, but also in some of the lesser towns of the governor-generalcy of Kiev, that is, in Cherkassy, Ovruch, Krasnosel'sk, Zviagol', and Zhitomir. Only in Smolensk and in Kiev itself were major posts rarely filled by Orthodox. Lesser posts in Smolensk and Kiev were, to be sure, open to Orthodox.

It must not be forgotten that that area which joined Moscow was essentially the area of Chernigov-Seversk. That fact presents a paradox—namely, that the area which had the largest proportion of Orthodox officials was the area which defected from Lithuania-Russia. That leads to the conclusion that anger over exclusion of Orthodox from public posts was not a primary motive, or that, alone, it was not a sufficient motive. If it had been, the greatest popular efforts to support the Muscovite cause should have occurred in the Smolensk and Kievan lands, where Orthodox appointees were far less numerous than in Chernigov-Seversk.

In spite of the above-mentioned increases in the proportion and number of Orthodox officials, the area of Chernigov-Seversk saw the introduction of Catholic officials, many for the first time in the history of a specific town, and the importation of Orthodox officials from the outside. In 1492 Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky, an Orthodox, was imported for the post of prefect of Chernigov, a position which he held until 1496. There may have been considerable popular dissatisfaction with this appointment, for in 1496 Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky, an Orthodox noble who had holdings in this region, was appointed as Glinsky's successor, thereby regaining control over an important part of the holdings of his own father, Ivan Andreevich. Another appointment which may have created antagonism was that of Pan Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich, a Catholic imported for the post of prefect of Briansk in 1492. Even the appointment of his predecessor, Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich, may have been received unfavorably, for Putiatich, although Orthodox, was not of the locality. Chernigov and Briansk had had officials who were presumably Orthodox of local families prior to the appointment of Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky, Pan Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich, and Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich. Since such appointments represented an attempt to impose Catholic officials or loyal agents of the Lithuanian government in the place of members of local families who were favorable to the interests of a particular region, they may have caused some unfavorable reaction. In this area the fear of the possibility of domination by Catholic Lithuanians may have been a factor producing unrest and eventual desertion. Furthermore, the local princes, as distinguished from the lesser nobles, of Chernigov-Seversk may have feared a loss of power through the presence of loyal agents of the central government. The probability that this last hypothesis is valid is increased by the realization that local princes were the largest group of those who deserted Lithuania for Moscow. Their suspicions may have been increased by the fact that nobles of lower rank held posts previously held by members of local princely families. This development in Chernigov-Seversk was in conformity with the general policy of the Lithuanian government, of allying itself with the lesser nobility against the greater nobility of the entire Lithuanian-Russian state, in particular against former *udel'nye* princes and their descendants, who might still have pretensions to a certain degree of autonomy.

It is interesting to note that Vitebsk, after about twenty years of Orthodox officials, received in 1495 an official who in spite of his Russian ancestry may well have been Catholic, Pan Stanislav Glebovich. He was succeeded no later than 1503 by his brother Pan Iuri.

In part the importation of Catholic officials may have been an effect rather than a cause of desertion. In Chernigov-Seversk, in Kiev, and in the district of Liubech', Catholic prefects were initially introduced—or reintroduced—only after the authority of the Lithuanian-Russian state had been challenged by desertion and by the coming of Muscovite troops. Such Catholic prefects were Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich of Chernigov, and Liubech', 1508, and governor-general of Kiev, 1507-08, Pan Stanislav Bartoshevich Montovtovich of Briansk, 1500, and Pan Andrei Iakubovich Nemirovich of Mozyr, 1510.

The desire of princes to desert was probably lessened in most areas, except in Chernigov-Seversk, by a policy of allowing princes to play a more active role in the government of Lithuania-Russia in the period after 1492. Of the 517 holders of posts, or to be more specific, of the 517 examples of a specific person holding a specific post, 88 involve princes. Further breakdown reveals that 51 of the total of 517 occurred in the period up to 1430; that is, individuals started to hold specific posts prior to 1430, although they may have continued after 1430. Five of these, or roughly 10 per cent, were princes. Sixty-six occur during the period from 1430 to 1452. Nine of these, or roughly 14 per cent, were princes. In the period from 1452 to 1492, 112 examples appeared. Fifteen of those, again roughly 14 per cent, referred to princes. For the period from 1492 to 1514, 288 examples appeared. Of those, 59, or roughly 21 per cent, referred to princes. That would seem to mean that after 1430 the policy instituted by Vitovt of depending upon the support of nobles of lower rank or of the pans of Lithuania was modified, and that more princes begin to appear in governmental service. Actually, however, most of the nine princes who appeared between 1430 and 1452 were appointees of Svidrigailo and choices of the people of Smolensk in 1440. Therefore there may have been no immediate modification of the policy of the central government. Such a modification certainly took place after the death of Svidrigailo, and particularly in the 1480's, for during that time princes appear as governmental agents not only in Chernigov-Seversk but also in Troki and Vilna. That policy was apparently further modified in the period from 1492 onward, for there is a great increase in the number of princes holding posts in the central areas of Lithuania proper—namely, Troki and Vilna. That increase is in part the result of the appearance of many members of the Glinsky family in various local governmental posts. The increase is apparent in all other areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state excepting those of Polotsk and Samogitia, where no princely officials appeared at any time during the period of this study, and excepting Chernigov-Seversk, which witnessed a decline in the number of princes acting as governmental officials on the local level. Since there was a substantial increase in the percentage of princes acting as local governmental agents during the period from 1492 to 1514, the decline in Chernigov-Seversk is all the more startling. Certainly such a development would tend to frighten the local aristocracy, some of whom had previously held those posts. But the Orthodox Russian princely nobility of Volynia or of Vitebsk would have some occasion to rejoice at the apparent improvement of their status. The emergence of princes as governmental officials would seem generally to indicate that those princes had become so much sub-

jected to the power of the central government that they no longer thought of recreating *udeli*, or that they were now more necessary to the well-being of the Lithuanian state because of the support which they were able to render it in the troubled time, 1492-1514.

Failure to implement fully the Privilege of 1434 may well have been a cause of dissatisfaction on the part of the Russian nobility in some but not all areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state and may have motivated them to join Moscow.

Generally it may be concluded that the promise of the Privilege of 1434 to extend rights and privileges to all of the nobles of Lithuania-Russia was not carried out in respect to appointment to governmental posts before 1492 and only began to be carried out after 1492. That statement does not apply, however, to Chernigov-Seversk or to Volynia, probably for different reasons. As indicated before, Orthodox Russian nobles of Volynia had been accustomed to act as officials in the time of Svidrigailo, and continued to do so after his death in 1452. Chernigov-Seversk was not fully under the control of the Lithuanian-Russian government; thus the policy of the central government in appointing officials in that region was, up to 1492, probably far more a response to local wishes than a reflection of general practices.

The general increase in the number of posts may have offered another motive. That increase usually meant a transference of power from local nobles to officials of the central government. To be sure, that increase was made somewhat less offensive by the fact that in some areas the local nobility retained the right of selecting the major officials, and even of advising them on major decisions. Even if the addition of officials meant only increased efficiency in the collection of taxes, the power of the local nobility was weakened.

The non-princely nobles probably resented the increase in the number of appointments of princes to governmental posts in the late fifteenth century. Princes, therefore, would have been less likely to desert Lithuania once they became the beneficiaries of these posts.

In the area of Chernigov-Seversk and the region of the Upper Oka the reaction to the appointment of officials probably caused resentment for different reasons than in most of the Russian areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state, for in Chernigov-Seversk ever since 1430 Orthodox officials predominated overwhelmingly. The opposite was true in Smolensk, Putivl, Cherkassy, and Kiev. In Smolensk and in Kiev the predominance of Catholic officials was reduced by the appearance of lesser officials who were Orthodox. It is interesting to note that whereas the overwhelming majority if not all of the lesser officials of Smolensk were native Russians, probably of Orthodox faith, among the lesser officials of Kiev none may be identified as natives and only Pan Sen'ko Polozovich was clearly a Russian of Orthodox faith and he apparently came from Pinsk when or before he was appointed keeper of the keys in Kiev. Moreover when he became prefect of Ovruch, which is in the Kievan land, he was the only prefect in the Kievan land who can be specifically proved to have been of Orthodox faith. In Podolia and Volynia and in Vitebsk there was a closer balance between Catholic and Orthodox governmental officials, with Orthodox officials tending to predominate from 1492 to 1514.

From the above, the following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) It was not practical for the Lithuanian government to set up Catholic officials or even imported Orthodox officials in Chernigov-Seversk. This may

have been because Lithuanian control over that region was never total. Therefore it would have been more desirable to try to bring that region under Lithuanian control by appointing members of local families to local governmental posts; with the exception of Petrash Montygirdovich, who held the post of prefect of Trubchevsk possibly in the fifties, no person clearly identifiable as a Catholic or as an Orthodox from another region held an important post in this area until war started between Moscow and Lithuania. From 1492 to 1496 Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky, probably an imported Orthodox, was prefect of Chernigov. Before it was lost to Moscow in 1500, however, that city became part of the holdings of Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky, who finally joined Moscow in 1500. Either late in 1499 or in 1500, when Pan Stanislav Bartoshevich replaced Prince Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky as prefect of Briansk, a Catholic took the place of an Orthodox, ostensibly to defend Briansk against Muscovite troops. The appointment of Stanislav Bartoshevich would seem to indicate that Great Prince Alexander of Lithuania relied more on Lithuanians to defend his eastern lands successfully from Muscovite attack. Perhaps he had reason to doubt the ability of Prince Feodor.

(2) The predominance of Catholic officials in Smolensk and Kiev might indicate that Smolensk and Kiev were more firmly under Lithuanian control and that the Lithuanian government had reason to fear the appointment of the Orthodox to important posts in these areas. The same might apply to Putivl' and Cherkassy, but they were under direct Lithuanian control for such a short period of time that there is little evidence to substantiate such a conclusion. The fear of the Lithuanian government may have been rooted in the efforts of the people in Smolensk and Kiev to cast off Lithuanian rule. There were uprisings in Smolensk in the forties, conceivably as an immediate result of famine and disease. There was trouble in Kiev, especially after the death of Prince Semion Olel'kovich and the appointment of a Catholic governor-general of Kiev, Pan Martin Gasztold.

(3) In Podolia and in Volynia the much larger number of Orthodox officials may be explained by the fact that these areas were for a long time under Svidrigailo, who was favorably inclined toward the Orthodox and appointed Orthodox officials, and by the fact that after the death of Svidrigailo the Lithuanian government tended to continue to appoint Orthodox officials who were members of families which had considerable power in this region and who because of their distance from Moscow were scarcely in a position to help Moscow or any other Russian state to the detriment of Lithuania. The situation in Volynia and Podolia was complicated by the fact that the Poles had claims to these areas, so that the support of the local population was indispensable to the Great Prince of Lithuania in his efforts to retain control of these regions against all Polish claims.

(4) The large number of Orthodox officials in Vitebsk is not easily explained. Perhaps there were many Catholic prefects or governors-general of Vitebsk in the period to 1492 who are not mentioned in the documents.

It seems likely, therefore, that resentment in the area of Chernigov-Seversk and in the Upper Oka region resulted from the mere increase in the number of officials and the importation of only a few officials, whether Orthodox or Catholic. The grant of Chernigov to Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky as part of his holdings is the clearest indication of such resentment. Chernigov had generally been in the hands of princes who held it as *otchina* or *patrimonium*. Only in

1488 did an official appear, except for some officials who early in the fifteenth century may have controlled Chernigov on behalf of Svidrigailo in his capacity as *otchina* holder. By 1496 the Lithuanian government had abandoned the idea of keeping it in the hands of an official. Instead, Mozhaisky, an Orthodox, received it first as a service holding and finally as *otchina*.

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

(Asterisks denote holder of more than one office; italics, a local ruler.)

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
VILNA					
Vilna	At the conflux of the Vileika and Vilna Rivers	Hanco	<i>capitaneus</i>	1382-85	Catholic
		Gasztold	<i>voevoda</i>	1389-91(?)	Catholic
		Pan Monivid	<i>voevoda</i>	1396-1405	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	1407	Catholic
		Pan Monivid	<i>voevoda</i>	1408-25(?)	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	pan	1413-15	Catholic
		*Pan Ostik	pan	1418-42	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	1425-29	Catholic
		*Rumbold	<i>voevoda</i>	1430	Catholic
		Pr. Vasilii Semionovich Drutsky	<i>voevoda</i>	1430-2(?)	Orthodox
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	1432-33	Catholic
		*Pan Dovgird	<i>voevoda</i>	1433-40	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Gasztold	<i>voevoda</i>	1441-57	Catholic
		*Pan Radivil	pan	1444-47	Catholic
		*Pan Kezgailo Volimuntovich	pan	1448	Catholic
		*Sen'ko Gedigold	pan	1451	Catholic
		*Pan Sudovoi Volimuntovich	pan	1452	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Monivid	pan	1458	Catholic
		Ivashko Ivashevich	pan	1460	Catholic
		*Pan Mikhailo Kezgailovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1460-77	Catholic
		Senko	pan	1477	
		*Pan Olekhno Sudimontovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1478-91	Catholic(?)
		*Pan Ian Kezkailovich	pan	1481-90	Catholic
		*Pan Mikolai Radivil	<i>voevoda</i>	1492-1507	Catholic
		*Pr. Aleksandr Iur'evich Gol'shansky	pan	1492-1509(?)	Orthodox
		*Pan Mikolai Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>voevoda</i>	1510-14	Catholic
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsky	pan	1511-14	Orthodox
		Khrshchon Neverovich	<i>tivun</i>	1494	
		Bogdan Kevla	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	
		Bogdan Voidivilovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499	
		Pan Martin Iakubovich Butrim	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	Catholic
		Pan Mishko Vezhgailovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1512	
		Pan Zanko Ivanovich	<i>gorodnichii</i>	1512	
		Ianko	<i>pod-koniushii</i>	1430's	Catholic
		Vezgailo	<i>koniushii</i>	1433	Catholic
		Ginvil	<i>koniushii</i>	1434	Catholic
		Vasko Doreshkovich	<i>pod-koniushii</i>	1494	
		Pan Mikhailo	<i>koniushii</i>	1497	
		*Pan Andrei Aleksandrovich Droshch	<i>koniushii</i>	1500-04	
		*Grigorii Isaevich Gromyko	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1509-12	
		Andrei	<i>mintsar</i>	1510	

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Braslavl'	NE of Vilna	?Ivan Viazhevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1453	Orthodox
		*Bogdan Andreevich Sakovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1469-74	Catholic
		*Pan Piotr Ianovich Montygirdovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1480-82	Catholic
		*Pan Mikolai Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1493	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Iur'evich Zenov'evich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	Orthodox
		*Pan Stanislav Ianovich Zaberezinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1500-01	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Semionovich Sopega	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-14	Orth.-Cath.
Dubinich	on Lake Il'ga 32 miles NNE of Vilna	?Pan Andrei Iuchkovich Sakovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1435	Catholic
		*Pan Bartosh Taborovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1501	Catholic
Kernov	On the banks of the Viliia River and the Kernuka Riv- ulet, 22 ½ miles NW of Vilna	<i>Vigunt Olgerdovich</i> Pr. Vasilii Ivanovich (Zheslavsky?)		1385-87	
			<i>derzhavtsa</i>	1507	
Kletsk	SE of Vilna	<i>Mikhailo Sigismundovich</i>		1440-?	Catholic
		*Pan Ivashko Rogatinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1441	Catholic
Kniazhichi	on the Lakhva River, 9 miles NW of Mogilev	*Pr. Matvei Mikitinich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	
Kopyl'	27 ½ miles NW of Slutsk	<i>Vladimir Olgerdovich</i> <i>Olel'ko Vladimirovich</i>		1392 to 1440	Orthodox Orthodox
		*Pan Piotr Montygirdovich <i>Mikhail Olel'kovich</i> and descendants	<i>namestnik</i>	1435	Catholic
				1440 on	Orthodox
Krevo	on the Krevka River, 23 miles SE of Oshmiany	Gasztold	<i>capitaneus</i>	1401	Catholic
		Pan Stanislav Narbutovich	<i>tivun</i>	1495	Catholic
Lida	on the Lida River, 53 ½ miles S of Vilna	*Pan Olechno Dovoinovich <i>Achi-Girei</i>	<i>namestnik</i>	1435 1439-45	Catholic Muslim(?)
		*Pan Pats Girdividovich	<i>starosta</i>	1453	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Khodkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1471	Orthodox
		*Pan Ian Kuchiuk	<i>namestnik</i>	1473-74	Catholic
		Pan Petrashko Pashkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1483	Catholic
		*Pan Stanislav Petrashkovich Kishka	<i>namestnik</i>	1493-99	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Ivanovich Il'inich	<i>namestnik</i>	1501-14	Catholic
Lositsa	NE of Teterin	*Pan Nemir Grimalich	<i>namestnik</i>	1506	

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Markov	near the Gordzeia, not far from Veleika	Pan Mikhailo Korsakovich Pan Ian Piotrovich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1457-83 1498-99	
Minsk	At the conflux of the Krupka and Slepna Streams with the Svisloch River, on Lake Plebenskoe	Pr. Ivan Iur'evich Zheslavsky Pr. Ivan Vasilevich Pan Mikolai Ivanovich Il'inich Pan Il'ia Ivanovich Il'inich Pr. Bogdan Ivanovich Zheslavsky	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1457-83 1489 1494-95 1497 1499-1514	Orthodox Catholic Catholic Orthodox?
Mogilev	near Krichov	*Pr. Matvei Mikitinich *Pan Iuri Iur'evich Zenov'evich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1503(?) -09 1514	 Catholic
Molodechno	near Minsk	Bogdan Koreevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499	Orthodox
Novgorod (-Litovsk)	on a tributary of the Niemen, 75 miles SW of Minsk	<i>Keistut Gediminovich</i> <i>Sigismund Keistutovich</i> <i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i> <i>Uliana</i> *Pan Piotr Montygirdovich Pan Ian Goshenits *Pan Piotr Montygirdovich *Pan Martin Ianovich Gasztold Pan Voitekh Monividovich *Pan Mikhailo Montovtovich *Pan Soltan Aleksandrovich *Pan Mikolai Radivil *Pan Iuri Patsovich *Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky *Pan Ian Litavor Bogdanovich Khrebtovich *Pr. Semion Iur'evich Gol'shansky Pan Piotr Glebovich *Pan Olbrakht Martinovich Gasztold *Pr. Ivan L'vovich Glinsky *Pan Olbrakht Martinovich Gasztold *Pan Ian Ianovich Zaberezinsky *Pan Zen'ko Evlashkovich	 <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>koniushii</i> <i>gorodnichii</i> & <i>kliuchnik</i>	to 1382 1382-85 1385 on 1428-30(?) 1430-32 1435 1440-55(?) 1457-71(?) 1475 1482-84 1486 1488 1492-96 1496-98 1499-1500 1500-01 1502 1503-05 1507-08 1508-09 1510-13 1482 1488-93	Pagan Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Orthodox?
Obolitsy	on the Obo-lianka River, 30 miles from Orshany	*Pan Iuri Glebovich *Pr. Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1500 1502-08	Catholic Orthodox

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Oshmiany	on the Osh- mianka River, 34 miles SE of Vilna	*Pan Minigailo Gedigold *Pan Ostik Mordas	<i>starosta</i> <i>starosta</i> <i>tivun</i>	1387-98 1401 1494	Catholic Catholic
Stoklishki	on the Medza Stream, 28 miles from Troki	Feodko Grigorevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-99	
Svisloch'	on the Svis- loch' River, 18½ miles from Volkovysk	*Grigorii Isaevich Gromyko	<i>derzhavtsa</i>	1510-12	
Teterin	on the Drut' River, 30 miles from Mogilev on the road to Minsk	*Pr. Matvei Mikitnich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	
Vileika	on the Viliia River, E of Vilna	*Pan Ian Kuchiuk *Pan Ian Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1469 1495-1503	Catholic Catholic
Vil'komir	on the Sviataia River and the Sokolauka and Vil'komirka streams, 44 miles SE of Kovno	*Pan Kezgailo Volimuntovich *Pan Shedibor Volimuntovich	<i>houptmann</i> <i>houptmann</i>	1409(?) - 18(?) 1424-25	Catholic Catholic
Volozhin	33 miles SE of Oshmiany	*Zen'ko Evlashkovich <i>Vasilii Mikhailovich Vereisky</i>	<i>tivun</i>	1482 1483-1500(?)	Orthodox Orthodox
Zbliane	on the Krou- zhovka River, 6 miles from Volkovysk	Pan Martin Bogdanovich Khrebtovich *Pan Andrei Aleksandrovich Droshch	<i>tivun</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1495 1503	Catholic?
TROKI					
Troki	on Lake Troki, 17 miles W of Vilna	<i>Keistut Gedeminovich</i> <i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i> <i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich</i> Kimunt Ginvil *Ian Sunigailo Iavnis *Pan Piotr Leliush *Pan Ian Gasztold	 <i>voevoda(?)</i> pan <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i> <i>voevoda</i>	to 1382 1384 1382-83 1384-88 1384(?) - 88(?) 1413-31 1412-32 1434-40 1440	Pagan Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		*Pan Radivil	<i>voevoda</i>	1444	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Monivid	<i>voevoda</i>	1444-53	Catholic
		*Pan Pats Girdividovich	pan	1452	Catholic
		*Pan Andrei Iuchkovich Sakovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1458	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Viazhevich	<i>voevoda</i>	1466	Catholic
		*Pan Radivil Ostikovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1466-82	Catholic
		*Pan Martin Gasztold	<i>voevoda</i>	1482	Catholic
		*Pan Bogdan Andreevich Sakovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1484-90	Catholic
		*Pan Mikhail Montovtovich	pan	1482-84	Catholic
		*Pan Mikolai Radivil	pan	1488-90	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky	pan	1490-99	Catholic
		*Pan Piotr Ianovich Montygirdovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1492-96	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky	<i>voevoda</i>	1498-1505	Catholic
		*Pan Stanislav Ianovich Kezgailovich	pan	1499-1514	Catholic
		*Pan Mikolai Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>voevoda</i>	1505-10	Catholic
		*Pan Grigorii Stanislavovich Ostikovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1511-14	Catholic
		*Mikhno Ivanovich	<i>tivun</i>	1492-1504	
		Zhdan	<i>tivun</i>	1494-1504	
		*Pan Aleksandr Ivanovich Khodkovich	<i>voevodich</i>	1502	Orthodox
		Pan Ivan Bogdanovich Sopega	<i>gorodnichii</i>	1511	Orthodox(?)
Belitsa	on the Nie- manka River	*Pr. Konstantin Feodorovich Kroshinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1498	Orthodox
	near its conflux with the Nie- men 18½	Nekrash Volochkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499	Catholic
	miles south of Lida	*Pan Feodko Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1501	Catholic
		*Pr. Iuri Aleksandrovich Gol'shansky	<i>namestnik</i>	1505-07	Catholic
Bel'sk	on the	<i>Kirdeeia</i>		1377-?	
	Belianka River,	<i>Mikhailo Sigismundovich</i>		1440-?	Catholic
	76 miles SW	Pan Bartosh Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1484	Catholic
	of Gorodno	*Pan Mikolai Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1488	Catholic
		*Pan Soltan Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1493-4	Orthodox
		*Pan Mikolai Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-1505	Catholic
		*Pr. Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1505-06	Catholic
		*Pan Voitekh Ianovich Klocho	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-11	
		*Pan Olbrakht Martinovich Gasztold	<i>starosta</i>	1513-14	Catholic
		*Pan Rachko Puchitsky	<i>tivun</i>	1495	

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Birshpany	on the Niemen River 44 miles W of Troki	*Pr. Matvei Mikitinich	<i>namestnik</i>	1503(?) -09	
Brest	at the conflux of the Mukhovetsa and Bug River, 198 miles from Gorodno	<i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i>		1387	Catholic
		Ivan	<i>namestnik</i>	1406	Catholic
		Mathias de Labishchin	<i>namestnik</i>	1419	Catholic
		Pan Ivashko Goitsevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1452	
		*Pan Olekhno Dovoinovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1452(?)	Catholic
		*Pan Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1483-87	Catholic
		Pan Senko Olizarovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-95	
		*Pan Mikolai Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1496-99(?)	Catholic
		Pan Stanislav Petkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1498-1504	
		*Pr. Aleksandr Iur'evich Gol'shansky	<i>starosta</i>	1507-10	Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Ivanovich Il'inich	<i>starosta</i>	1510-14	Catholic
		Lev Bogovitinovich	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1495-97	Orthodox
Dersunishki	on the Niemen and Lapoina Rivers, NW of Troki	*Pan Ian Gasztold	<i>namestnik</i>	1422	Catholic
		Pan Voitekh Ivashkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	
		<i>Pan Venslav Kostevich</i>		1510	Catholic?
Dovkchi	SSE of Zhizh-mory	*Pan Iuri Iakubovich Devoinovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1501-?	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1509	Catholic
		*Pan Bogush Bogovitinovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1509-14	Orthodox
		Pan Mikolai Dorkgeevich	<i>tivun</i>	1492	?
Drogichin	astride the Bug River, 111 miles from Gorodno & 102 miles SW of Belsk	Ian	<i>palatinus</i>	1388	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Il'inich	<i>namestnik</i>	1473	Orthodox
		Pan Iakub Ivanovich Dovoinovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1486-99	Catholic
		Pan Stanislav Stetskovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1501	Catholic
		Pan Ian Stetskovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1501-09	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Litavor Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1510	Catholic?
		*Nasut	<i>sud'ia,</i> <i>starosta</i>	1432-40	Orthodox?
		Vodyn	<i>pisar</i>	1495	
		Mikhail Vodynsky	<i>sud'ia</i>	1507	
Dubichi	58 miles SSW of Vilna	*Pan Mikolai Iundilovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499-1514	
Eishishki	on the Versoka River, 24 miles NW of Lida	Olekhno Gabar'	<i>namestnik</i>	1488	
		Pan Piotr Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1496-99	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1499	Catholic
		Pan Andrei Iakubovich Dovoinovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1508-11	Catholic

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Ezdno	on Lake Ezno	*Pan Mikhno Ivanovich Elena *Pr. Matvei Mikitinich	<i>tivun</i>	1504 1507	Catholic Orthodox Orthodox
Gorodno	on the right bank of the Niemen near the Gorodnichanka, W of Lida	<i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i> Mikhailo Montvid Pan Andrushko Dovoinovich *Pan Olekhno Sudimontovich Pan Stanko Sudivoevich Ian Nasutich *Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky *Pr. Aleksandr Iur'evich Gol'shansky *Pan Stanislav Petrashkovich Kishka *Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil Fedko Gavrilovich Kot Ofonos Dudka	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>gorodnichii</i> <i>kliuchnik</i> <i>kliuchnik</i>	1386-90 1422 1440-47 c. 1458 1469-75 1484 1506-07 1486-1503 1507-13 1514 1499 c. 1502 1505	Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic? Catholic Orthodox? Catholic Orthodox Catholic Catholic Catholic
Iasvoine	on the Shushva River, 28 miles N of Kovno	*Pan Voitekh Narbutovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499-1510	Catholic
Koneva	SE of Stoklishki	*Pan Mikolai Iundilovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1500-14	
Kovno	between the Niemen and Viliia Rivers	*Ian Sunigailo *Pan Shedibor Volimuntovich Ian Sunigailo *Pan Sudivoi (Volimuntovich) Pan Stanko Kostevich *Pan Voitekh Ianovich Klochko *Pan Ian Litavor Bogdanovich Khrebtovich Vashko Dashkovich Stanislav Narbutovich	<i>houptmann</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>gorodnichii</i> <i>tivun</i>	1409-15 1418-21 1422 1449-51 1486-96 1497-1509 1510-14 1511 1495	Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic? Catholic Catholic
Lepun'	near Volkiniki(?)	(same officials as Volkiniki) Pr. Gleb Pronsky			
Mel'nik	112 ½ miles from Gorodno, near Bel'sk	*Nasut *Pan Rachko Puchitsky *Pan Nemir Grimalich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1440 1495 1499-1511	Orthodox? Orthodox?
Merech	at the conflux of the Merechenka and Viliia Rivers with the Niemen, S of Troki	Pan Mikhail Martinovich *Pan Stanislav Glebovich *Pan Grigorii Stanislavovich Ostikovich *Pr. Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky *Pan Iur'i Patsovich *Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1486-88 1492-95 1495-1500 1501-05 1505 1505-14	? Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Moishagol'e	WNW of Troki	*Pan Bartosh Taborovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1501	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1506-07	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Andreevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1508	
Nemoniuny and Olita	on the Niemen River, SW of Troki	*Pan Piotr Olekhnovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-1502	Catholic
Onikshty	on the Sventa River, 26½ miles from Vil'komir	*Pan Gregorii Stanislavovich Ostikovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-1500	Catholic
		*Pr. Matvei Mikitinich	<i>namestnik</i>	1503(?) -09	
Ostryn'	on the Ostrinka Stream	Pr. Gleb Pronsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1501	Orthodox
		*Pan Feodko Bogandovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	before 1510	Catholic
Ozha	SW of Lida, W of Vasilishki	*Pan Andrei Olekhnovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1493-94	
		*Pr. Ivan L'vovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1504	
		*Pan Voitekh Narbutovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1509-10	Catholic
Perelom	W of Troki	(same officials as Ozha)			
Prelai	near Perelom	*Pan Bogush Bogovitinovich Mikhail Viazhevich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>tivun</i>	1500-05 1494-96	Orthodox
Punia	on the Niemen River, 35 miles W of Troki	*Pan Stanislav Bartoshevich Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1493-99	Catholic
		Pan Ian Piotrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1500	
		*Pan Aleksandro Ivanovich Khodkevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	Orthodox
Radun	near the Radunka River & Lida	Ianush Stankovich Kostevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1496-1511	Catholic?
		Montvil	<i>tivun</i>	1444	Catholic
		Sen'ko Androshevich	<i>tivun</i>	1488	
Ros'	9 miles from Volkovysk	*Pan Iuri Glebovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1500	Catholic
		*Pr. Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-14	Orthodox
Skerstomon	NW of Troki	*Pan Feodor Ianushevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-07	Orthodox
		*Pan Piotr Olekhnovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-08	Catholic
Slonim	astride the Shchara River, 104 miles SE of Gorodno	Pan Mishko Veshtortovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1471	
		*Pan Soltan Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1483-90	Orthodox
		*Pan Ian Litavor Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1492-1500, 1510	Catholic?
		Pr. Ianush Gol'shansky	<i>namestnik</i>	1503	
		*Pan Ian Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-09, 1511-12	Catholic
Utsiana	on the Utsianka Rivulet and the Zizhnoitsa, 40 miles from Vil'komir	*Pan Ian Litavor Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1489	Catholic?
		*Pan Voitekh Ianovich Klochko	<i>namestnik</i>	1493-97	
		*Pr. Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1498-1506	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Andreevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1508	
		*Pan Piotr Olekhnovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1512	Catholic

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Vasilishki	SW of Lida	Pr. Vasilii L'vovich Glinsky *Pan Stanislav Petrashkovich Kishka *Pan Ian Iakubovich Shchitovich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1501-05 1506-07 1508	 Catholic
Velena	NW of Zhizhmory	Pan Martin Iakubovich *Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil *Pan Ivan Andreevich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1504 1507-08 1510-14	Catholic
Volkiniki	on the Merechanka River	Pan Iakub Kuntsovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1511-14	
Volkovysk	on the Volkovia River, S of Slonim, S of Gorodno	*Pan Ivan Il'inich *Pan Ivan Dovoinovich *Pan Voitekh Kuchiuk *Pan Ian Ianovich Zaberezinsky	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1473 1492-94(?) 1495-1503 1507-09	Orthodox Catholic Catholic? Catholic
Vysokodvor	on the Verkna River	*Pan Mikhno Ivanovich *Pan Bogdan Semionovich Sopega	<i>tivun</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1493-94 1503-08	Catholic Orthodox
Zhizhmory	on the Strava River, 28 miles NW of Troki	*Pan Ivan Semionovich Sopega *Pan Bogush Bogovitinovich *Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil *Pan Kopot Vasilievich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1502-06 1509 1509 1509-12	Orthodox Orthodox Catholic
Zholubok	on the Zholudchanka River near Lida	Iuri Strynel' *Pan Martin Bogdanovich Khrebtovich Pan Shimok Kiborotovich	<i>tivun</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1493-95 c. 1500 1511	Catholic
PODLIASH'E					
(entire region)		*Pan Ivan Semionovich Sopega	<i>voevoda</i>	1513-14	Orthodox, then Catholic
VITEBSK					
Vitebsk	on both banks of W Dvina & the Vit'ba Stream	<i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich</i> <i>Uliana</i> Feodor Vesna <i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i> *Rumbold <i>?Iuri Semionovich Mstislavsky</i> *Pan Piotr Leliush *Pan Pats Girdividovich *Pan Ian Khodkovich *Mikolai Nemirovich *Pan Ivan Il'inich *Pr. Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky Pr. Mikhailo Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky *Pan Stanislav Glebovich	 <i>namestnik</i> <i>starosta</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1391 to 1392 1392 1392(?) 1422 1440-42(?) 1452 1452 1452(?) - 57(?) c. 1467(?) - 73(?) 1483-86 1492 1492-95 1495-1501	Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Catholic Orthodox Catholic? Catholic Orthodox Catholic Orthodox Orthodox Orthodox Catholic

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		*Pan Iuri Glebovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1503-08	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Semionovich Sopega	<i>namestnik</i>	1509-12	Orthodox
		*Ianush Stankovich Kostevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1514	Catholic?
Drutsk	on the right bank of the Druts', 43 miles NW of Mogilev	*Pr. Grigorii Borisovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-03	Orthodox?
POLOTSK					
Polotsk	at the conflux of the Polova & W Dvina Rivers, 73 ½ miles NW of Vitebsk	<i>Andrei Olgerdovich Polotsky</i>		to 1386	Orthodox
		<i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich</i>		1386-95(?)	Catholic
		Montygird	<i>namestnik</i>	1396-97	Catholic
		*Nemir	<i>namestnik</i>	1412	Catholic
		Tovtko	<i>namestnik</i>	1422	Catholic
		Pr. Ivan Semionovich Drutsky	<i>namestnik</i>	late 1420's	Orthodox
		*Pan Andrei Iuchkovich			
		Sakovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1444-57	Catholic
		*Pan Olekhno Sudimontovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1457-75	Catholic?
		*Pan Bogdan Andreevich			
		Sakovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1480(?) -84	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1484-96	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Patsovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1496-1502	Catholic
		*Pan Stanislav Glebovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-05	Catholic
			<i>voevoda</i>	1505-11	
		*Pan Olbrakht Martinovich			
		Gasztold	<i>voevoda</i>	1514	Catholic
		Piotr Sestrenets Navumovich	<i>voskov-nichnii</i>	1507	
		Radivon Borov	<i>voskovnichii</i>	1507	
		Sava Bernishchev	<i>voskovnichii</i>	1507	
		Iakub Kezmarkovich	<i>lentvoit</i>	1505	Catholic?
SAMOGITIA					
(entire land)		<i>Jagailo Olgerdovich</i>		to 1435	
		*Rumbold	<i>houptmann</i>	1409-11	Catholic
		*Pan Kezgailo Volimuntovich	<i>starosta</i>	1412-48	Catholic
		<i>Mikhail Sigismundovich</i>		1440-42	Catholic
		Kontovtov Dovmont	<i>starosta</i>	1440-42	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Kezgailovich	<i>starosta</i>	1449-84	Catholic
		*Pan Stanislav Ianovich			
		Kezgailovich	<i>starosta</i>	1486-1514	Catholic
Mednik	NW of Troki	*Kezgailo Volimuntovich	<i>houptmann?</i>	1418	Catholic
		Matsko Stromilko	<i>namestnik</i>	1467	

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
SMOLENSK					
Smolensk	Dniepr River	<i>Sviatoslav Ivanovich Smolensky</i>		to 1386	
		Pr. Skirgailo Olgerdovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1386	Catholic
		<i>Iuri Sviatoslavovich Smolensky</i>		1386-95	
		*Pr. Iamunt Tuluikovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1395-1398(?)	Catholic
		Vasilii Boreikov	<i>namestnik</i>	1395-1401(?)	Catholic
		<i>Iuri Sviatoslavovich Smolensky</i>		1401-04	
		Ian Butrim	<i>voevoda</i>	1422	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	1424-25	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Gasztold	<i>namestnik</i>	c. 1439	Catholic
		*Pan Andrei Iuchkovich Sakovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1440	Catholic
		Pr. Andrei Dmitrievich Dorogobuzhsky	<i>voevoda</i>	1440	Orthodox
		*Pr. Iuri Semionovich Lingven Mstislavsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1440-42(?)	Orthodox
		*Pan Andrei Iuchkovich Sakovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1442(?)	Catholic
		*Sen'ko Gedigold	<i>namestnik</i>	1450	Catholic
		*Pan Mikhail Kezkailovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1451-55	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Viazhevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1459-66	Catholic
		*Mikolai Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1467	Catholic
		Ivashko Iatskovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1469	
		*Pan Mikolai Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1475-86	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Il'inich	<i>namestnik</i>	1487-89	Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Glebovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1492-99	Catholic
		*Pan Mikolai Ivanovich Il'inich	<i>namestnik</i>	1499	Catholic
		*Pan Stanislav Petrashkovich Kishka	<i>namestnik</i>	1500-03	Catholic
		Pan Iuri Andreevich Sologub	<i>namestnik</i>	1503-07	
		*Pan Iuri Iur'evich Zenovievich	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-08	Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Glebovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1511-14	Catholic
		Pan Iuri Andreevich Sologub	<i>voevoda</i>	1514	
		*Pr. Konstantin Feodorovich Kroshinsky,	<i>kaznachei</i>	1481-1503	Orthodox
		Pr. Timofei Filippovich Kroshinsky	<i>kaznachei</i>	1508	Orthodox
		Ivan Antonovich Koshka	<i>okolnichii</i>	1482-98	Orthodox
		Semion Aleksandrovich	<i>okolnichii</i>	pre 1486	Orthodox
		Feodor Alekseev	<i>okolnichii</i>	1486	
		Pr. Olekhno Vasilievich Glazinich	<i>okolnichii</i>	1486-99	Orthodox
		Pr. Timofei Vladimirovich Mosal'sky	<i>okolnichii</i>	1487-93	Orthodox
		Ivashko Krivets	<i>okolnichii</i>	1493-95	Orthodox?
		*Boris Semionovich Aleksandrovich	<i>okolnichii</i>	1498	Orthodox
		Pr. Ivan Ivanovich	<i>okolnichii</i>	1506(?)	

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		*Bogdan Semionovich Sopega Avram	<i>oĭolnichii starosta of the city</i>	1508-12 1508-09	Orthodox Jewish
Krichov	on the Sozha River	<i>Iuri Semionovich Mstislavsky</i> Vasko Oshushisin Pan Iuri Iur'evich Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1440-42(?) 1508-09 1511	Orthodox Catholic
Luchin	Usozha River E of Smolensk 16 miles from Sevsk	<i>Vorotynskys</i> *Pr. Olekhno Vasil'evich Glazinich	<i>namestnik</i>	to c. 1490 1495-99	Orthodox Orthodox
Toropets	131 miles NE of Polotsk	*Pan Zen'ko Evlashkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1492-98	
CHERNIGOV-SEVERSK AND LOOSE DISTRICTS					
Chernigov	Desna and Strizhna Rivers, SW of Trubchevsk 467 miles from Moscow	<i>Konstantin Olgerdovich</i> <i>Grytsko Konstantinovich</i> <i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i> <i>Feodor Liubartovich</i> <i>Aleksandr Vasil'evich</i> <i>Czartoryski</i> Ian *Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky <i>Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky</i> *Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i> <i>derzhavtsa</i>	1369 or 1370 to 1388, 1389, or 1390 1388, 1389 or 1390 to (?) 1406-1408(?) 1420-1430 1408(?)- 1420(?) 1462-1477 1488 1492-1496 1496-1507 1509 on 1508	Catholic Orthodox Orthodox Orthodox Catholic
Briansk	Desna River 79 miles from Orel	<i>Dmitri Olgerdovich</i> <i>Dmitri-Koribut Olgerdovich</i> <i>Roman Mikhailovich</i> <i>Briansky(?)</i> <i>Alexander Patrikeevich</i> <i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i> <i>Sigismund Keistutovich</i> *Iuri Ivanovich *Pan Nemir Rezanovich <i>Mikhail Sigismundovich</i> <i>Vasilii Iaroslavovich</i> <i>Semion Ivanovich Obolensky</i> <i>Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky</i> Pan Ian Zavishenits *Pr. Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich	<i>namestnik</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1379 or 1380 1379 or 1380 1379-80 1393-1401(?) 1401 to 1406 or 1408 1406(?)-1408 1408-1430(?) 1430's 1434 1440-1446(?) 1446 1446-1450(?) 1450-1483(?) 1486-1487 1487-1488	Orthodox Orthodox Orthodox? Catholic Catholic Orthodox Orthodox Orthodox

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		Pr. Semion Feodorovich Sokolinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1492	
		*Pan Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1492-94	Catholic
		*Pr. Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-99	Orthodox
		*Pan Stanislav Bartoshevich Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1500	Catholic
Kozelsk	Upper Oka Region north of Briansk, left bank of Zhizdra River, both banks of the Druga or Dragunka	(local rulers) <i>Ivan Vladimirovich</i> of Moscow Pr. Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky Pr. Dmitri Feodorovich Vorotynsky		to 1410 1410	Orthodox Orthodox
			<i>namestnik</i>	1447-	Orthodox
			<i>namestnik</i>	-1490	Orthodox
Liubech'	on the Dnepr River and Uzhika Stream	<i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich Monivid</i> <i>Ian Monivid</i> <i>Vasilii Mikhaïlovich Vereisky</i>		1387-? 1482 1483-1500(?)	Catholic Catholic Catholic Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1508	Catholic
Liubutsk	on the Oka & Liubucha Rivers, 32 miles from Kaluga	? <i>Aleksandr Patrikeevich</i> <i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i> (?) <i>Ivan Vladimirovich</i> of Moscow <i>Iuri Romanovich Odоеvsky</i>		1402(?) 1406-08(?) 1410 1423	Catholic Orthodox Orthodox
		*Mikolai Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1467	Catholic
		*Pr. Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich	<i>namestnik</i>	to 1487	Orthodox
		*Pr. Ivan Iur'evich Trubetskoi	<i>namestnik</i>	1487-90	Orthodox
		*Boris Semionovich Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1492-93	Orthodox
		*Pan Nemir Iakubovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1494	
		*Pan Bogdan Semionovich Sopega	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-96	Orthodox
Mtsensk	Zusha River, 31 miles from Orel	Identical princes and office-holders as Liubutsk, except: Grigorii Protasiev		1406-96	
			<i>voevoda & namestnik</i>	1423-37	Catholic
Rechitsa		<i>Sigismund Keistutovich</i> Ivan Krach Pan Mikhail Chaletsky		1408-30 1481 1488-1511	Catholic
			<i>namestnik</i>		
Trubchevsk	Desna River 52°35'N, 33°47'E	<i>Andrei Olgerdovich</i> <i>Dmitri-Koribut Olgerdovich</i> (Lithuanian namestniki?) <i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		Pre 1377 to 1379 or 1380 1379 or 1380 to 1392(?) (1392-1419) 1420-30	Orthodox Catholic

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		Pan Petrash	<i>namestnik</i>	before 1452	
		<i>Ivan Vasilevich Czartoryski</i>		c. 1452	Orthodox
	(one-half)	Pan Grinko Volovich	<i>koniushii</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1455-60 1460	
		<i>Aleksandr Vasilevich Czartoryski</i>		after 1460	Orthodox
		Pan Ian	<i>namestnik</i>	1477	Orthodox
	(one-half)	Pr. Iuri Mikhailovich Trubetskoi	<i>namestnik</i>	1452(?)	Orthodox
		*Pr. Ivan Iur'evich Trubetskoi	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1500(?)	Orthodox
		KIEV			
Kiev	Dniepr River	<i>Vladimir Olgerdovich</i>		1382-95(?)	Catholic
		<i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich</i>		1395-97(?)	Catholic
		Pr. Ivan Olgimuntovich Gol'shansky	<i>voevoda or</i> <i>namestnik</i>	1397-?	Catholic?
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	pre 1411	Catholic
		Pr. Mikhailo Ivanovich Gol'shansky	<i>nominal</i> <i>voevoda</i>	1422-32	Catholic?
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>voevoda</i>	1424-25	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Monivid		1434	
		*Iuri Ivanovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1435-37	Orthodox?
		<i>Mikhail Sigismundovich</i>		1442-43(?)	Catholic
		<i>Olel'ko Vladimirovich</i>		1440-55	Orthodox
		<i>Semion Olel'kovich</i>		1455-70	Orthodox
		*Pan Martin Ianovich Gasztold	<i>voevoda</i>	1471, 1473-82	Catholic
		*Pan Ivan Khodkevich	<i>voevoda</i>	1482	Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Patsovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1486-89	Catholic
		*Pr. Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich	<i>voevoda</i>	1492-1505	Orthodox
		*Pr. Ivan L'vovich Glinsky	<i>voevoda</i>	1505-07	
		*Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1507-08	Catholic
		*Pr. Iuri Aleksandrovich Gol'shansky	<i>voevoda</i>	1508-10	Catholic
		Pan Iuri Khodkovich	<i>voevoda</i>	1510	Orthodox
		*Ian Iakubovich Shchitovich	<i>derzhavtsa</i>	1511	
		*Pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivil	<i>voevoda</i>	1512-14	Catholic
		*Pan Semion Polozovich	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1493-99	Orthodox
		Shikma	<i>mytnik</i>	1488	Jewish
		Danilovich	<i>mytnik</i>	1488	
		Samodelka	<i>mytnik</i>	1488	
		Sanko	<i>mytnik</i>	1497-99	
		Tsibul	<i>mytnik</i>	1497-99	
Cherkassy	SW of Putivl'	*Pan Kmita Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-95	
		Pr. Ivan Dashkovich (Glinsky?)	<i>namestnik</i>	1500	Orthodox

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		Pr. Vasiliï Danilovich Glinsky	<i>starosta</i>	1507	Orthodox
		*Pr. Timofei Ivanovich Kapusta	<i>namestnik</i>	1511	
Krasnosel'sk	Sukhor	Pr. Ivan Vasil'evich Koretsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1492	Orthodox
	Pashlyka	Ivashko Zenov'evich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	Orthodox
	River, 43 miles W of Chicherin	Mikhno Andreevich	<i>tivun</i>	1495	
Mozyr	Pripiat' River near Mstislavl'	Iakub Ivashentsovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1506-07	Catholic(?)
		Pan Andrei Iakubovich Nemirovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1510	Catholic
		*Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Radivil	<i>namestnik</i>	1512-14	Catholic
Ovruch'	Gorynia	Volchoko Romanovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1478	Orthodox
	River, S of Mozyr	*Pan Senushko Romanovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1485	Orthodox
		*Pan Roman Ivashkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1486-87	Orthodox
		Pan Gornostai Romanovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1489-93	Orthodox
		*Pr. Grigorii Borisovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1496-1503(?)	Orthodox
		Pan Semion Romanovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1506	Orthodox
		*Pan Semion Polozovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1510-14	Orthodox
Putivl'	right bank of the Selm River, 120 miles WSW of Kursk	namestniki(?)		1400-20	
		<i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		1420	Catholic
		<i>Olel'ko Vladimirovich</i>		1440-55	Orthodox
		<i>Semion Olel'kovich</i>		1455-1470	Orthodox
		*Pan Roman Ivashkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1476-82	Orthodox
		*Pan Kmita Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1486-90	Orthodox
		Pr. Bogdan Feodorovich Glinsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1500	Orthodox
Zhitomir	at the conflux of the Teterev River and the Kamenka Stream, SW of Zviagol'	<i>Vladimir Olgerdovich</i>		to 1394 or 1395	
		*Pan Semion Romanovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1488	Orthodox
		Pan Dmitri Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1502-06	
		Andrei Prazhovsky	<i>namestnik</i>	after 1506	
Zviagol'	W of Kiev	Pan Onushko Kalenikovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1488	
		Iatsko Mezinits	<i>namestnik</i>	1494-96	
		*Konstantin Ivanovich Oztrozhsy		1507 on	Orthodox
PODOLIA					
(entire land)		<i>Feodor Koriatovich</i>		to 1393	
		unnamed starosty		?	
		<i>Pan Spytko Mel'shtinskii</i>		to 1399	Catholic
		<i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		1400-02(?)	Catholic
		<i>Jagailo Olgerdovich</i>		1402-10	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>starosta</i>	1415-22	Catholic
		*Pan Dovgird	<i>starosta</i>	1430	Catholic
		*Pan Minigailo Gedigold	<i>starosta</i>	1430	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Monivid	<i>starosta</i>	1436-38	Catholic
		Pr. Feodko Nesvitsky	<i>starosta</i>	1434	Orthodox

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Braslavl'	on the left bank of the S Bug, 107 miles east of Kamenets	<i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		1400-02(?)	Catholic
		Pr. Vasilii Sangushkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	c. 1490	Orthodox
		Pr. Feodor Ivanovich Chetvertensky	<i>namestnik</i>	after 1494	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy	<i>namestnik</i>	1498-1500	Orthodox
		*Pr. Andrei Aleksandrovich Sangushlovich	<i>namestnik</i>	c. 1501	Orthodox
		Pr. Mikhail Vasil'evich Zbarazhsy	<i>namestnik</i>	1504-07	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-14	Orthodox
Kamenets	on a penin- sula in the Smotrich River	Albert	pan	1414	Catholic
		Andrei de Domeborz	pan	1424	Catholic
		*Pan Dovgird	pan	1430	Catholic
		*Pan Ian Monivid	<i>namestnik</i>	1436-38	Catholic
		*Nasut	<i>namestnik</i>	1444	Orthodox(?)
		Pan Feodor Olizarovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1454	
		*Pan Ivashko Rogatinsky <i>Aleksandr Vasil'evich</i>	<i>namestnik</i>	1461	Catholic
		<i>Czartoryski</i>		1462-76	Orthodox
		Pan Pavel Khodkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1476	Orthodox
		*Pr. Semion Iurievich Gol'shansky	<i>namestnik</i>	1501-04	Orthodox
		Pr. Semion Aleksandrovich Czartoryski	<i>namestnik</i>	1507	Orthodox
				1480's	Orthodox
Vynitsa	conflux of Vinnichka & Bug Rivers, NE of Kamenets	*Pan Kmita Aleksandrovich		1480's	Orthodox
		Pan Byk Aleksandrovich	<i>namestnik</i>	c. 1492-94	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	Orthodox
		*Pr. Andrei Aleksandrovich Sangushkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	c. 1501	Orthodox
		Pan Olekhno Kozinsky	<i>starosta</i>	1506	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy	<i>namestnik</i>	1507-14	Orthodox
VOLYNIA					
(entire land)		<i>Liubart Gedeminovich</i>		to 1382	
		<i>Feodor Liubartovich</i>		1382-92	
		<i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i>		1392-1430	
		<i>Feodor Liubartovich</i>		1430	
		<i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		1430-37 & 1442-52	
		*Pan Olizar Kirdeevich Shilovich	<i>marshal</i>	1480-86	Orthodox
		*Pan Piotr Ianovich			

LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
		Montygirdovich	<i>marshal</i>	1486-90	Catholic
		*Pr. Semion Iur'evich			
		Gol'shansky	<i>marshal</i>	1494-99	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich			
		Ostrozhsy	<i>marshal</i>	1500-01	Orthodox
		*Pr. Semion Iur'evich			
		Gol'shansky	<i>marshal</i>	1502-05(?)	Orthodox
		Pr. Mikhail Ivanovich			
		Ostrozhsy	<i>marshal</i>	1505	Orthodox
		*Pan Feodor Ianushevich	<i>marshal</i>	1506-07	Orthodox
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich			
		Ostrozhsy	<i>marshal</i>	1507-14	Orthodox
Lutsk	at the conflux of the Gizhitsa stream and Styr' River, 161 miles WNW of Zhitomir	<i>Liubart Gedeminovich</i> <i>Feodor Liubartovich</i> <i>Feodor Danilovich Ostrozhsy</i> <i>Vitovt Keistutovich</i> Pr. Feodor (Danilovich Ostrozhsy?) Pr. Alexander Nos *Pan Ian Gasztold *Ian Ivanovich Pan Kozarin Rezanovich		to 1382 1382-86 1386-87 1387 1388 1433-34 1434-35(?) c. 1435 1437-38 1443	Orthodox Catholic Orthodox?
		*Pan Ian Voinitsky Pr. Feodor Mikhailovich Czartoryski	<i>starosta</i>	1438 1449	Orthodox Orthodox
		*Pan Nemir Rezanovich	<i>starosta</i>	1450-52	
		*Pan Ivan Khodkevich	<i>starosta</i>	1457-71(?)	Orthodox
		*Pan Olizar Shilovich Kirdeevich and successors identical to marshals of the Volynia land	<i>starosta</i>	1480-86	Orthodox
		Pan Iushko Voidatovich	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1440's(?)	
		Pan Andrei Feodkovich	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1456 or 1471- 86	
		Pan Bogdan Sen'kovich Gostsky	<i>kliuchnik</i>	1492-99	Orthodox
		*Pr. Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich	<i>gorodnichii</i>	1475(?) - 80(?)	Orthodox
		Geresh	<i>mytnik</i>	1501-03	Catholic
		Mikel Prokopovich	<i>mytnik</i>	1505	
		Shamak Danilovich	<i>mytnik</i>	1506	
		Tikhno Kisel	<i>diel'chii</i>	1514	
		Vanko Oshchovsky	<i>diel'chii</i>	1514	
		Gavrilo Kholonevsky	<i>diel'chii</i>	1514	Orthodox
		Matvei Krasovsky	<i>diel'chii</i>	1514	
		Feodor Olizarovsky	<i>diel'chii</i>	1514	
Gorukhovo		*Pan Vasilii Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	Catholic?

MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES

<i>Town</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Official</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Religion</i>
Kremenets	Igra River Valley between mountains reaching altitude of over 1300 ft., 180 miles south of Zhitomir	<i>Skirgailo Olgerdovich</i>		1395 or 1396	Catholic
		Kondrat Prus		1418	Catholic
		<i>Dashko Feodorovich Ostrozhsky</i>		1418	Orthodox
		Pr. Feodko Nesvitsky		1434	Orthodox
		*Ian Monivid(?)	<i>starosta(?)</i>	1438	Catholic
		<i>Svidrigailo Olgerdovich</i>		1447-52	Catholic
		<i>Olel'ko Vladimirovich</i>		1452-55	Orthodox
		<i>Semion Olel'kovich</i>		1455-70	Orthodox
		Pr. Semion Vasilevich Zbarazhsky	<i>namestnik</i>	1475(?) - 80(?)	Orthodox
		*Pr. Andrei Alexandrovich Sangushkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1506	Orthodox
		*Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1506-07	Catholic
Olesin		*Pan Ian Voinitsky	<i>starosta</i>	1438	Orthodox
Vladimir	on the left bank of the southern Bug	<i>Feodor Liubartovich</i>		to 1393	
		Ian de Koszczol	<i>namestnik</i>	1419	Catholic
		Martin	pan	1419	Catholic
		Kostiushko	<i>starosta</i>	1442	
		Pr. Mikhail Konstantinovich Ol'shanitsky	<i>starosta</i>	1446-51	Orthodox
		Pan Pashko Daokhnovich	<i>starosta</i>	1451	Catholic?
		*Pan Olizar Shilovich Kirdeevich		1461-75, 1480-84	Orthodox
		Pan Ivashko Iursha	<i>namestnik</i>	1488-89	Catholic?
		*Pan Voitekh Kuchiuk	<i>namestnik</i>	1494	Catholic?
		*Pan Vasilii Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495-1501	Catholic?
		Pr. Vasilii Andreevich Polubensky	<i>namestnik</i>	1502	Orthodox
		?Pan Feodor Ianushevich	<i>namestnik</i>	1503-07	Orthodox
		Pr. Andrei Aleksandrovich Sangushkovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1508-14(?)	Orthodox
		Pan Vasilii Bogdanovich Khrebtovich	<i>namestnik</i>	1495	Catholic?
		*Pr. Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsky		1496 on	Orthodox
Zdolbitsa	54 miles ESE of Lutsk				

VI. THE POSITION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

The treatment which the Orthodox Church received within the Lithuanian-Russian state might have affected the decision of West-Russian nobles to desert Lithuania for Moscow. Consequently, the position of the Church as a visible institution must be examined. For the purposes of this examination the Church is understood to be both the clergy—i.e., metropolitans, bishops, priests, and lesser secular clergy, and abbots, monks, and lesser monastic officials—and church properties—i.e., cathedrals, churches, and monasteries.

The historian, Archbishop (later Metropolitan) Makarii, asserts that the Popes, by their exhortations to proceed against the schismatic Orthodox, were not the prime instigators of governmental actions unfavorable to the Orthodox Church. He insists that "the real persecutors of the Russians in Lithuania were the Latin clergy and prelates, just as the Russians themselves said to Sixtus IV in their well-known missive."¹ Although his assertion was meant to apply to the later part of the reign of Casimir IV, the suggestion that the local Catholic clergy in the Lithuanian-Russian state may have been the major source of unfavorable actions against the Orthodox Church merits investigation not only for the reign of Casimir but for the entire period 1377-1514. Unfortunately source materials are either insufficient or not now available to make possible an examination of the actions of local Catholic clergy. To be sure, there is information about specific actions, but it seems impossible to establish any clear lines of local Catholic policy, distinct from papal policy or distinct from the policy of the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state. There is also a question whether the local Catholic clergy would have had a policy differing greatly from papal policy, modified by the religious policy of the government.

In establishing the position of the Church as an institution, I shall emphasize (1) papal policy, (2) governmental policy, and (3) the political and economic position of the Orthodox Church within the Lithuanian-Russian state as compared with the political and economic position of the Catholic Church within that same state.

Papal policy toward Eastern Europe was dominated by two considerations: the desire to spread the true faith by converting the heathen, the heretic, and the schismatic and the desire to protect Christendom by preventing the expansion of the power of the rising Ottoman Turks. These two considerations found joint expression in efforts to heal the split between the Eastern and Western Churches, a split which had seemed final and decisive in 1054 but which seemed less so in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as the Eastern Church, eager to protect Christendom, found that it could no longer rely upon the Byzantine Empire to repulse the advance of the Turks, and so began to seek help in the West. Papal policy tended to be less effective and less consistent until the pontificate of Nicholas V, 1447-1455, because of the Great Schism and the struggle between the Pope and the Councils (which came to an end in the final session of the Council of Lausanne, April 25, 1449).²

Almost coincidental with the death of Olgerd in 1377 was the decision of Pope Urban VI in 1378 to remain in Rome, instead of returning to Avignon, whence he had come in order to assure continued papal control of lands in Italy. His decision was interpreted as a threat to French domination of the Church, a domination which had been so great as to keep the center of papal power in

Avignon since 1309, when Clement V moved there. Urban's action helped to produce the Great Schism of the Western Church, which occurred when French cardinals elected a counter-Pope, Clement VII, who held court in Avignon. The Schism may be considered to have lasted either until 1415, when Pope John XXIII, the Conciliar Pope, and Gregory XII, his Roman counterpart, abdicated, and Benedict XIII, the pontiff at Avignon, was declared deposed, or until November 11, 1417, when Othone Colonna was elected Pope Martin V. From that time Martin V was considered Pope by all Catholics, except Benedict XIII and his supporters, who did not admit the power of a council to depose a Pope. Their dissent ended with the death of Benedict in 1423. The end of the Schism may be regarded as the work of the Council of Constance, 1414-1418, called together by Pope John XXIII at the instance of Sigismund, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

During the period of the Great Schism only Popes recognized by Lithuanians were in a position to formulate and further papal policy in the Lithuanian-Russian state: namely, the Roman Popes, Urban VI, 1378-1389, Boniface IX, 1389-1404, Innocent VII, 1404-1406, Gregory XII, 1406-1409,³ and the Conciliar Pope, John XXIII, 1410-1415.

During this period the Church demonstrated great interest in reuniting the Eastern and Western branches of the Church and in extending the boundaries of Christianity by converting the remaining pagans of Europe, particularly those of Lithuania proper. That interest caused the Church to follow a policy outlined by earlier Popes, particularly Innocent III, of spreading the Christian faith with the help of the Prussian and Livonian Orders of the Teutonic Knights. While these knights had succeeded in subduing whole peoples to the north and to the west of Lithuania, they failed in Lithuania, subduing only the westernmost group of the Lithuanians, the Samogitians. The other Lithuanians had maintained their freedom, primarily because of the ability of their native rulers, Mindovg and Gedemin, who had managed progressively to mold disparate tribes into a state in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Although Lithuanian rulers toyed with Christianity, the paganism of their Lithuanian subjects and the Orthodoxy of their increasingly numerous Russian subjects may have caused them to observe caution whenever they considered Catholicism. The Catholic Church got its greatest opportunity to extend the boundaries of Catholic Christendom in Eastern Europe as a result of two developments.

First, Olgerd died in 1377. Although sole ruler, he had shared control of the Great Principality of Lithuania with his brother, Keistut. Olgerd ruled over the Russian areas and Keistut over the Lithuanian areas. Olgerd's son, Jagailo, was unwilling to share control with his uncle, Keistut, and so instigated his assassination in 1382. Thus Jagailo united an area which, because of Olgerd's conquest of additional Russian lands, was the largest united Great Principality of Lithuania which had ever existed.

Second, in 1382 died Louis the Great of Anjou, who had been King of Hungary since 1342 and King of Poland since the death in 1370 of his maternal uncle, Casimir the Great, the last of the Piasts. Louis was succeeded in Poland by his daughter, Hedvig, who was elected king, not queen, in the year of her father's death.

The necessity of finding a spouse for the new "king" and the manifest ability of Jagailo in gaining and retaining control over Lithuania presented the tempting

possibility of uniting Poland and Lithuania under a pair of rulers, bound together by marriage. This implied the creation of a powerful state better able to look after the interests of Poland and the acquisition by Catholic Christendom of a large area, the schismatic and the pagan inhabitants of which might be converted. The schism of 1054 might be undone, at least in Russian lands, and the conversion of the heathen Lithuanians, which the Livonian and Prussian orders of the Teutonic Knights had failed to accomplish by the sword, might now be accomplished by the sacraments of baptism and marriage. As a prerequisite to his marriage, which took place in 1485, Jagailo was obliged to embrace Catholicism; he took the name of Vladislav in baptism.

Papal policy had supported the establishment of the Catholic Church in Orthodox areas from 1363, when a papal bull authorized the erection of a Catholic cathedral in L'vov, but papal policy had been primarily concerned with the spread of Catholicism in areas under Polish control.⁴

In the period of this study the first evidence of an interest in Lithuania on the part of the Catholic Church is a letter written in 1378 by Gregory XI, the last of the pre-Schism popes, to Vitovt Keistutovich, then Prince of Kamenets, addressing him by the Christian name of Alexander and offering him remission of his sins if he would become Catholic.⁵ The attempt at conversion does not seem to have meant that the Papacy had abandoned hope that Teutonic Knights might convert the pagan Lithuanians. As late as 1381 Urban VI apparently believed that the Livonian sword was a useful tool for the accomplishment of that purpose, for he wrote encouragingly to the Livonian Order, insisting that "... we wish no bishop to be there [in Lithuania] who is subordinate to any other than the Roman Pontiff."⁶ Thus Urban VI also pointed up the fact that the Orthodox Church had been making inroads into Lithuania. Perhaps he felt that the Livonian Order might assist in reconverting those Lithuanians who had embraced Orthodoxy.

A shift in papal policy followed the marriage of Hedwig and Jagailo, the Krevo Union of 1385, and the Privilege of 1387, which aimed at the "increase of the Holy Faith and the strengthening of the Catholic religion."⁷ No longer were the Teutonic Knights encouraged to assist in the conversion of Lithuania; instead the realization of papal goals was sought through the help of the governments of Lithuania and Poland.

Coincident with that change in papal policy was the emergence of another goal—namely, stemming the tide of Turkish advance. In 1393 the Turks conquered Bulgaria, thus exposing the flank of the weakened Byzantine Empire. John Paleologus, Emperor of Byzantium, appealed for papal help. Out of this appeal developed a Western crusade against the Turks, which grew in intensity and significance as Turkish conquests brought Ottoman power closer to Catholic lands. In 1399 Boniface IX appealed to the Bishop of Cracow to obtain subsidies in Poland, Lithuania, Russia, Podolia, and Wallachia for the fight against the Turks and their allies the Tatars.⁸ Thereafter, help against the Turks and Tatars and conversion of the schismatic and pagan were twin goals of papal policy in Lithuania.

The extirpation of the "detestable and horrible schismatic" was sought of Jagailo by Innocent VII, and Martin V requested Vitovt to convert the Orthodox of Novgorod, Pskov, Samogitia, Lithuania, and Russia.⁹ Requests for help

against the Bohemian heresy and congratulations on the struggle against the Turks were forthcoming from Martin V.¹⁰

The increasing importance which the Papacy attached to Lithuania and Poland and the decline in the significance of the Teutonic Knights as a tool for the implementation of papal policy is evident from several papal steps. In 1393 Bishop John of Messina came to Lithuania to seek Lithuanian help in putting an end to hostilities and to look into the status of the Catholic Church in Lithuania.¹¹ After the Battle of Tannenberg of 1410, in which Poles, Lithuanians, and Russians defeated the Prussian Order, support of Lithuania and Poland against the requests of the Teutonic Knights characterized papal policy. In 1415 John XXIII ordered the Prussians to surrender land inhabited by Lithuanians to Vitovt,¹² and at the Council of Constance accusations of paganism, leveled by Johannes Falkenberg of the Prussian Order against the Poles, were rejected.¹³

Falkenberg and the Prussia he represented were outmoded.¹⁴ The extent of Martin V's support of Poland may be debated. Actually the Pope's failure to support the condemnation of Falkenberg's libels by the Council of Constance was linked to the question of Papal supremacy.¹⁵

The idea of a union between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches soon came to occupy a prominent place in papal policy. As the sword of the Turks, temporarily dulled by the hammer-blows of Timur (or Tamerlane), regained its sharpness, papal concern with the idea increased. By 1433 Pope Eugene IV and the Council of Basel were competing for the right to call and direct a council to effect a union, but by 1437 the Church Fathers at Basel were compelled to yield to the Pope because of the demands of the Greeks for a convenient meeting place.¹⁶ Consequently the Council met in Ferrara and later in Florence. From its deliberations resulted the Florentine Union of 1439, which was supported by members of the Orthodox hierarchy of Byzantium and by a large part of the Western Church, and proclaimed the union of the Eastern and Western Churches.¹⁷ The Council of Florence had two major effects on papal policy towards the Orthodox Church in the Lithuanian-Russian state: (1) It brought about renewed emphasis upon the extirpation of heresy. One of the participants at the Councils was Isidor, a Greek who was appointed Metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia by the Patriarch in 1437. In 1439 Eugene IV, the successor of Martin V, urged Isidor en route to Moscow and Lithuania to strengthen the Catholic faith.¹⁸ (2) It weakened the effectiveness of Eugene's efforts to promote papal policy in Lithuania. The Union of Florence affirmed the supremacy of the Pope. That affirmation was a triumph for the Pope as against the pretensions of the Council of Basel,¹⁹ but the Lithuanian hierarchy and the Lithuanian government, both officially neutral in the struggle between the Pope and the Council of Basel, tended to support the latter. Consequently papal policy favoring the union was not promoted by the Lithuanian hierarchy. Indeed, Matvei, Bishop of Vilna, seems to have intrigued against the efforts of Isidor to effect the union.²⁰ Moreover, encouraged by his triumph at the Council of Florence, Eugene IV attempted on August 23, 1439, to nullify the decrees of the Council of Basel by promising punishment to those who followed them. His attempt resulted in the election on December 17 of an anti-Pope, Felix V, whom the Lithuanians regarded as the true Pope.²¹

The shattering of the hope of Union and the victory of Pope Nicholas V over Conciliar forces in 1449 were followed by a resumption of emphasis upon

the strengthening of the Catholic Church in the Lithuanian-Russian state. On May 26, 1452, Nicholas wrote to the Bishop of Vilna, complaining of Catholic-Orthodox marriages.²² On May 20, 1452, Isidor had left Rome with fifty soldiers, the Pope's final and rather modest succor for beleaguered Orthodox Constantinople.²³ The slightness of papal help suggests that even before the fall of Constantinople in 1453, union had temporarily ceased to be a prominent goal of papal policy,²⁴ with modest interruptions such as the support of Grigorii as Metropolitan of Kiev in 1458.

Emphasis upon the extirpation of heresy became the leitmotif of papal policy.²⁵ In 1501 an unidentified cardinal praised Great Prince Alexander of Lithuania for reducing Orthodox to Catholics.²⁶ In spite of that emphasis, the struggle against the Turks continued to receive attention, especially whenever the Turks were threatening the West.²⁷ All in all, it must be admitted that neither the extirpation of heresy in Lithuania nor the search for Lithuanian help against the Turks represented Catholic goals in the second half of the fifteenth century, which possessed the same degree of importance or attracted the same degree of papal attention as in the first half.

The policy of the Lithuanian government was generally more favorable to the Orthodox Church than was papal policy. Prior to the Krevo Union the desire for a separate, Lithuanian-dominated metropolitanate had already been manifested in the attempt to appoint Feodorit Metropolitan of Lithuania, 1353-54, by the appointment of Roman who held that office, 1354-61, and by Olgerd's successful agitation for the appointment by the Patriarch of Cyprian as Metropolitan of Lithuanian lands 1373-74.²⁸ Olgerd may well have hoped to dominate all Russia through his metropolitan, for Cyprian was promised the metropolitanate of all Russia upon the death of the incumbent, Alexei. This promise reflected Olgerd's agitation in 1371 and later for a pro-Lithuanian Metropolitan of all Russia. Although Alexei died in 1378, Muscovite opposition prevented Cyprian from using the title of Metropolitan of all Russia until 1381. He was supplanted by Pimin in 1382 and perhaps not until 1389 did he again enjoy the title.²⁸

The Krevo Union of 1385 and the Privilege of 1387 set a precedent which was to be a guiding element of Lithuanian policy until 1432 or 1434. That policy was one of supporting the Catholic Church. An immediate consequence thereof may well have been the decision of Cyprian to remain in Moscow, for in 1387 he acquired Patriarchal recognition of his claim to the Muscovite metropolitanate and from 1390 until his death he remained in Moscow except during 1396-97 and 1405-06.²⁹ A long-range consequence may well have been the weakening of the political and economic position of the Orthodox Church relative to that of the Catholic Church. Catholic bishops began to appear on the Council of the Great Prince of Lithuania during the reign of Vitovt;³⁰ whereas Orthodox bishops did not enjoy the opportunity of advising Vitovt. The participation of Catholic bishops may have resulted both from the support of the Lithuanian government of the Catholic Church and from the fact that Catholic bishops had property rights which identified them with the noble landholders. As they served on the Great-Princely Council they came to be chosen from Lithuanian noble families.³¹ As a result the Catholic Church came to enjoy greater economic rights than did the Orthodox Church.³²

Although the Act of Union of 1401 and the Horodlo Union of 1413 con-

tained pledges to support the Catholic Church,³³ and although Vitovt's campaigns of 1397-99 against the Tatars, which ended in his defeat in 1399 at Vorksla, represented in part the implementation of papal policy,³⁴ Vitovt's policies toward both the Orthodox and Catholic Churches were characterized by an emphasis upon political goals.³⁵ Vitovt resumed Olgerd's policy of trying to create a separate Orthodox metropolitanate within the boundaries of the Lithuanian-Russian state. The death of Cyprian in 1406 (?) led to the appointment of Fotii as Metropolitan of all Russia. Because Fotii was pro-Muscovite, Vitovt quarreled with him and after a year's efforts effected the appointment in 1415 of Gregory Tsamblak, who was Lithuanian metropolitan until he vanished in 1419 or 1420.³⁶ Vitovt was obliged, however, to accept Fotii in 1420. Vitovt struggled to create a completely autonomous Lithuanian Catholic Church, and particularly to get control of the Samogitian Church organization. Although the Teutonic Order of Prussia had surrendered Samogitia by the First Peace of Thorn (or Torun), on February 1, 1411, Vitovt succeeded in creating a Samogitian bishopric no earlier than 1413,³⁷ and the first mention of a Samogitian bishop is that of Nikolai, who was elected in 1422.³⁸ Thus, Vitovt succeeded in integrating the Samogitian Church organization with that of Lithuania. Moreover, he successfully resisted the efforts of Bishop Gnesen of L'vov to divide Lithuania in two in order to keep it hierarchically subordinate to Poland. Instead Vitovt sought to subordinate the Catholic Church in Lithuania to the bishopric of Vladimir.³⁹

During the reign of Vitovt another line of Lithuanian policy emerged, support of the idea of union between the Eastern and Western branches of Christendom. In 1418 at the Council of Constance Gregory Tsamblak supported the idea of union.⁴⁰ His disappearance seems to have helped reduce the importance of the idea of union as an element of Lithuanian policy.

Initial support of the idea of union may have been linked with a growing consciousness of the importance of the Orthodox Church to the success or failure of Lithuanian political plans. Although the chronicles are silent on this score, perhaps the later part of the reign of Vitovt saw increasing evidence of Orthodox dissatisfaction. Such evidence might have increased solely because the percentage of Orthodox in the total population of the Lithuanian-Russian state was increasing as that state was expanding. Particularly after the death of Vasili I in 1425, Vitovt, guardian of his youthful grandson Vasili II, and no longer confronted with Muscovite opposition to his expansionist plans, was able to force Riazan, Periaslav, Odoev, Vorotynsk, Novosel'e, and Pronsk to pay him tribute.⁴¹ Whatever may have been the cause, a new policy of toleration came increasingly to characterize the treatment of the Orthodox Church within lands of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

In 1430 Vitovt insisted that the rights of those of Orthodox faith in Bel'sk be protected.⁴² At his death later that year, Svidrigailo was chosen as his successor. Svidrigailo, a Catholic, was favorable to the Orthodox and may have been preferred by them as well as by the Lithuanians as a ruler even prior to the death of Vitovt.⁴³ To the dissatisfaction of the Catholic Sbigneus, Svidrigailo appointed Orthodox to governmental posts.⁴⁴ Svidrigailo's activities may well have been accelerating the tempo of application of a policy of toleration, for in 1432 Jagailo, King of Poland, in control of Lutsk since the death of Vitovt, and not in opposition to Svidrigailo, issued two Privileges which not only demonstrate the policy of tolerance of Orthodox but also reflect past practices. The first is a charter to

the "prelates, boyars, soldiers, and nobles of the land . . . of Lutsk, whether in the faith of the Holy Roman Church, or [in that] of the East."⁴⁵ Here for the first time the Orthodox hierarchy is specifically accorded rights in a general Privilege, though only within the land of Lutsk. The hierarchy is granted the same rights enjoyed by the Catholic hierarchy of Poland. It is specifically exempt from all services and tributes excepting the *solitum census annuum*. Moreover, the charter specifies: "We promise . . . that . . . we will neither cause nor permit either Ruthenian or Greek rite churches either to be destroyed or to be made over into churches of the Roman Church, and we will not force with violence any person of the aforementioned Greek rite of whatever sex or station into the faith of the Roman Church." That statement seems to indicate that the practices abjured were not wholly unknown in the Lutsk land in bygone years.

The second document is a Privilege to the nobles of Lithuania from Jagailo.⁴⁶ Although this document sought to put the Orthodox nobles of Lithuania on a juridical level with Catholic nobles of Lithuania, no mention is made of the rights to be enjoyed by the Orthodox Church. Apparently, then, Jagailo was unwilling to extend to all Lithuania those privileges which had been granted to Lutsk. When Jagailo's Privilege was given the force of law in a Privilege issued by Sigismund Keistutovich, Great Prince of Lithuania, in 1434, the Orthodox Church was not granted the equality of the Lutsk charter.⁴⁷ Thus, although the Orthodox nobles had their juridical position improved, the same was not true of the Orthodox Church except in Lutsk.

Sigismund's successor, Casimir, apparently extended the rights of the Polish to the Lithuanian Catholic hierarchy. The Privilege of 1447 was granted to the "spiritual prelates and secular dukes, barons, nobles, boyars, and citizens."⁴⁸ Thus the charter to the Lutsk land was extended to all Lithuania, but applied only to the Catholic Church, not to the Orthodox Church. The relative position of the Orthodox Church was weakened.

Between the Privilege of 1434 and that of 1447 the idea of union was being promoted at the Councils of Ferrara and Florence and throughout Eastern Europe by the peripatetic Metropolitan Isidor. The Privilege of 1434, with its grant of equality to Orthodox nobles, seems to have been in the spirit of oecumenical unity; however, the idea of unity did not receive support from the Lithuanian government. The Lithuanian government and hierarchy, although officially neutral, supported the Council of Basel against the Pope. Before Isidor could get to Lithuania to proclaim the Union, the Council of Basel had deposed Pope Eugene IV and elevated in his stead a counter-Pope, Felix V. Consequently, the Lithuanian government and hierarchy were not disposed to accept the idea of oecumenical union as promoted by Eugene IV.⁴⁹ Their indisposition may have been increased by the fact that a union might tend to comfort or strengthen Svidrigailo, the pro-Orthodox Great Prince, whom Sigismund had ousted with difficulty and who had appealed on behalf of the Orthodox to the Council of Basel in March, 1439.⁵⁰ In 1447 Casimir, after having become King of Poland, abandoned the Council of Basel and submitted to the newly elected Pope, Nicholas V.⁵¹ The inability of Nicholas to give material support to Constantinople and thus to advance the oecumenical union coincided with Casimir's apparent desire to avoid advancing that union. By his Privilege of 1447, granted before he left for Poland, Casimir indicated his decision to depend for support in Lithuania on the Catholic hierarchy and not on the Orthodox. By the grant of free-

dom from duties, Casimir sought to bind the nobles of the Lithuanian-Russian state to him.⁵² These acts may well have been the result of the threat of Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich, who had occupied Kiev in 1442-43 with Muscovite help⁵³ and whose strong army had made Casimir unwilling to accept his own election as King of Poland in 1445 for fear of losing Lithuania to Prince Mikhail.⁵⁴ Perhaps because of that problem and perhaps because of fear of eventual additional Muscovite help to Prince Mikhail, Casimir went further than just avoiding encouraging the idea of oecumenical union: he abandoned the struggle for a separate Lithuanian-dominated metropolitanate, a struggle which had been waged not only by Olgerd and Vitovt, but most likely also by Svidrigailo, who, on the death of Fotii, had successfully supported Gerasim, Bishop of Smolensk, for the post of metropolitan, which he held to 1435.⁵⁵ In 1449 Casimir signed a treaty with Moscow and, in 1451, he accepted the Muscovite Metropolitan of all Russia, Iona, as Metropolitan of Kiev.⁵⁶ That accommodation with Moscow may have represented a decision on the part of Casimir to give up Vitovt's expansionist plans.⁵⁷ There is no evidence, however, that that accommodation resulted in a bettering of the position of the Orthodox Church.

At the instance of Pope Pius II, Casimir suffered a renewal of efforts for oecumenical union when he allowed the Uniate, Grigorii, to become Metropolitan of Kiev, 1458.⁵⁸ It is interesting to note that, although some Orthodox nobles rejected Grigorii,⁵⁹ the first period of substantial grants to the Orthodox Church occurred during his tenure of office, 1458-1473.⁶⁰ That might argue that Grigorii, with or without the approval of Casimir, encouraged gifts to Orthodox monasteries and churches. However, Casimir's enthusiasm for oecumenical union, if it ever existed, had waned by 1468, when he wrote Pope Paul II that there were still many heretics and schismatics in the Lithuanian-Russian state and requested the Pope to strengthen the Bernardine Order in that land in order to make conversions possible.⁶¹ There is no evidence of further support by Casimir of the idea of oecumenical union. Even Grigorii deserted the idea of union when he returned to Orthodoxy in 1470.⁶²

Thereafter Casimir's policy was limited to the alternatives of supporting conversion of Orthodox to the Catholic Church and of supporting the Orthodox Church. The complaint of Misail, metropolitan-elect, in 1476, to Pope Sixtus IV about friction between Orthodox and Catholics, caused by efforts of the Catholic clergy to convert Orthodox,⁶³ and the plot to assassinate Casimir in 1481, spearheaded by some of the lay signers of the letter of 1476, such as Prince Mikhail Olel'kovich and Prince Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky, and rooted in dissatisfaction with the position of the Orthodox Church, seem to indicate that Casimir at least permitted a deterioration in the position of the Orthodox Church, from no earlier than 1468 to 1481. During the last decade of his reign, Casimir seems to have offered a measure of support to the Orthodox Church in the Lithuanian-Russian state, both by allowing a large number of grants to Orthodox monasteries and churches⁶⁴ and by making some grants himself.

Basically Casimir pursued an anti-Orthodox policy until the plot of 1481—that is, against the Orthodox Church, but not against Orthodox nobles. The plot of 1481 may have convinced him that it was impossible to expect the loyalty of Orthodox nobles if an anti-Orthodox Church policy were followed by the government. Moreover, the early eighties probably were the time at which Casimir became aware of a shift in the balance of power which made support of the

Orthodox nobility more important to the well-being of the Lithuanian-Russian state than ever before. In the period up to 1450 Moscow had been relatively weak in comparison with Lithuania. Her weakness resulted in part from her inability to cast off Tatar overlordship and her small size. Disastrous was the civil war during which Iuri, uncle of Vasiliï II, and after Iuri his son, Dmitri Shemiaka, had been trying to get the Muscovite throne. Although himself a casualty of the war, Vasiliï II emerged the ruler of a country considerably increased in strength and dominion. Lithuania, on the other hand, had been strong in comparison with Moscow. This was true because of her close connection with Poland. Although that connection had not spared her defeat in the Battle of Vorksla of 1399 against the Tatars, it had gained victory for her in the Battle of Grūnewald (or the so-called First Battle of Tannenberg) in 1410 against the Prussian Order of the Teutonic Knights. Lithuania had been strong because she had little competition for the role of unifier of Russian lands not under the control of the Tatars and because she had little competition for the position of protector or savior of border princes who were anxious to cast off the Tatar yoke. Parallel to the civil war in Moscow was a decline in power of the Golden Horde, a final splintering of that once mighty realm. Its decline had been sufficiently great to allow Moscow effectively to sever all but nominal ties with the Golden Horde and to set up a satellite Tatar buffer state, Kasimov, in 1452 and was to permit her to acquire complete independence in 1480. The decline in the power of the Golden Horde either produced or coincided with the decision of many *udel'nye* princes, especially of the area of Chernigov-Seversk, to make anti-Tatar alliances with Lithuania. In a sense these alliances might be regarded more as declarations of independence from Tatar control than as declarations of submission to the Lithuanian-Russian state. If that state were to profit from the defection from Tatar control of the princes, she would need to be tolerant of their Orthodox faith. Moreover, as a result of the conclusion of the Muscovite civil war, other Orthodox princes were forced to flee to Lithuania. Profit from their adherence to the Lithuanian cause might also have been dependent upon a pro-Orthodox policy. In sum, there had been a change in the balance of power by the middle of the fifteenth century as a result of several developments: (1) the decline of Tatar power, (2) the end of the Muscovite civil war, and (3) the drift toward independence in the form of co-operation with Lithuania of the *udel'nye* princes of Chernigov-Seversk. The shift in the balance of power was a disadvantage to Lithuania. That disadvantage may have been sufficiently perceptible to Casimir to induce him to make peace with Moscow in 1449 and to accept Iona in 1451, thus giving up, in a sense, Lithuanian expansionist plans. That may also have induced Casimir to follow a policy of more liberal treatment of the Orthodox nobles by granting them more rights and allowing them a greater share in the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state but does not seem to have induced him to follow a policy of more liberal treatment of the Orthodox Church until the eighties.

What had happened by the eighties which could have persuaded Casimir to change his policy? The power of Moscow was becoming evident. Prior to the middle of the century Lithuanian conquests in Russia were made at the expense of the Golden Horde. The decline of the Golden Horde resulted in a power vacuum which only rulers of Russian principalities could fill. Since Moscow was the strongest Russian principality after Lithuania, she became the natural competitor of Lithuania. But Moscow was more successful than Lithuania in extend-

ing her control. In 1463 Moscow seized Iaroslavl' and purchased half of Rostov. One immediate effect of those steps was a short-lived alliance between the Great Principality of Tver, Moscow's western neighbor, and Lithuania. A partial effect was the alliance of 1470 between Novgorod the Great and Lithuania. That alliance resulted in a successful Muscovite attack on Novgorod in 1471 and the eventual complete subjugation of Novgorod to Moscow in 1478. In the eighties Moscow loomed stronger than ever because of her alliance with the Crimean Tatars. In 1474 Ivan III started preliminary negotiations with Mengli-Girei, Tatar Khan of the Crimea, which led to that alliance and to Tatar attacks upon Lithuania. The first important attack was on Kiev in 1484. Thus Ivan III was in a position to encourage attacks on the Lithuanian-Russian state without engaging in a war. Moreover, in 1485 he subdued Tver, after the reigning prince had made another ill-fated attempt to ally himself with Lithuania. The conjunction of events, the clear evidence of Muscovite power, the Crimean Tatar attacks on Lithuania, and the assassination plot of 1481 may have convinced Casimir that a policy of toleration toward the Orthodox Church was essential.

Casimir's son, Alexander, who succeeded him as Great Prince of Lithuania, seems to have continued his father's policy of the eighties, if grants to Orthodox monasteries and churches are any indication.⁶⁵ Moreover, the Privilege of 1492 apparently granted to all members of the Orthodox hierarchy and of the Catholic hierarchy rights which had been previously granted by specific charters.⁶⁶ The rights enjoyed by the Catholic hierarchy of Poland and previously granted in privileges to the Catholic hierarchy of Lithuania were granted to the Orthodox hierarchy, apparently for the first time.⁶⁷

The practical value of a policy of toleration toward the Orthodox Church may well have seemed doubtful to Alexander, for part of the time during which that policy was pursued, 1490-94, was a period of maximum desertion of Lithuania by Orthodox West-Russian nobles.⁶⁸ That fact may have abetted Alexander's effort to strengthen the Catholic Church. For example, he limited the rights of Jews and even expelled some Jews from Lithuania;⁶⁹ he also endowed a Bernardine monastery in Grodno, 1494.⁷⁰

From 1495 to 1500, Alexander seems to have wavered between a policy of supporting the Orthodox Church and a policy of supporting the Catholic Church and the idea of oecumenical union. His wavering may have been in part the result of the apparent necessity (as a result of Lithuania's defeat at the hands of Moscow⁷¹) for Lithuania to seek closer relations with Poland, which Ian Olbracht, brother of Alexander, now ruled separately. A Lithuanian project of 1496 to renew the political aspects of the Horodlo Union of 1413 between Lithuania and Poland is testimony to the Lithuanian search for Polish help.⁷² Alexander's instructions to Martin, Bishop of Samogitia, and Pan Ian Zaberezinsky, his envoys to Ian Olbracht in 1499 for the purpose of discussing union, emphasize political problems, such as possible trouble with the Tatars and Moscow.⁷³ In no document is there any mention of strengthening the Catholic Church through closer relations with Poland.⁷⁴ In spite of that fact the search for such closer relations might have had as its logical sequel a tendency to strengthen the Catholic Church or to favor the idea of oecumenical union.⁷⁵ The appointment by Alexander in 1498 of Iosif Bolgarinovich, Bishop of Smolensk, as Metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia, may have represented a desire to promote oecumenical union, for Iosif was favorable to such union.⁷⁶ Alexander's desire may have sprung from his

politically weak position vis-à-vis Moscow, which had brought him, in the hope of bettering Lithuanian-Muscovite relations to marry Elena, daughter of the Muscovite Great Prince, Ivan III, and to promise that Elena could remain Orthodox. In conformity with the Papal policy of rooting out heresy, Pope Alexander had apparently insisted that Alexander attempt to convert Elena to the Catholic faith.⁷ The extent to which Alexander attempted to convert his wife and the extent to which he encouraged a policy of promoting union or of strengthening the Catholic Church by conversions are difficult to determine. In 1500 Princes Semion Ivanovich Bel'sky, Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky, and Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiakin deserted Lithuania for Moscow, among other reasons because of pressure to abandon the Orthodox Church.⁷⁸ Alexander's wavering between a pro- and anti-Orthodox Church policy may have come to an end either late in 1499 or early in 1500. He may well have decided to support an anti-Orthodox policy; there are several indications that he may have done so. (1) From April 4, 1499, to July 16, 1503, there is no evidence that Alexander did anything to support the Orthodox Church through grants or Privileges. On April 4, 1499, he confirmed the rights of the Orthodox Bishop of Briansk and Chernigov,⁷⁹ and on July 16, 1503, he promised the inhabitants of Vitebsk not to interfere with Orthodox churches or to harm the faith.⁸⁰ This is unusual when it is considered that except for this gap, not a year passed in the reign of Alexander without his defining bishops' powers, promising to protect Orthodox rights, or granting land or rights or confirmation thereof to an Orthodox church or monastery. (2) In 1501, an unnamed cardinal praised Alexander for his help to the Catholic hierarchy in its attempts to convert the Orthodox.⁸¹ That praise is reminiscent of the praise by Pope Martin V of Vitovt for fighting against the Turks.⁸² (3) Although Iosif, the metropolitan, died in 1501,⁸³ Alexander may have waited until 1503 to appoint Iona as his successor.⁸⁴ Of course, Alexander's negotiations with Moscow may have delayed his making sure that there was a metropolitan; however, had Alexander been eagerly pursuing a policy of union or of supporting the Orthodox Church, he would certainly have lost no time at this critical juncture of his relations with Moscow and with his Russian subjects in selecting a metropolitan posthaste. Therefore it seems likely that from 1499 or 1500 to 1503 Alexander followed an anti-Orthodox policy.

From 1503 to 1514 both Alexander and his successor, Sigismund, seem to have followed a policy of supporting the Orthodox Church with grants⁸⁵ and to have dropped both the policy of supporting the Catholic Church and of advocating union,⁸⁶ possibly because of a decision that support of Orthodoxy was a better weapon in the struggle with Moscow than support of Catholicism or of the idea of oecumenical union. Consequently, the letter of Vasilii III in June, 1507, to his sister Elena, widow of Alexander, Great Prince of Lithuania, sounds like a baseless attempt to resurrect the complaint of his father that the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state was trying to convert Orthodox to Catholicism.⁸⁷ Vasilii insisted that he could not see Orthodox subordinated to the rule of Rome, and inquired after Elena's health. The letter sounds as if Vasilii was trying to help Elena say that she was the object of persecution.⁸⁸

During the period 1377 to 1514 the policy of the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state shifted from support of Catholicism to support of union under Vitovt, to tolerance of Orthodoxy possibly just before but certainly after the death of Vitovt, to support of the Catholic Church, to support of union under

Casimir, to direct support of Orthodoxy by Casimir and Alexander, to support of union, to support of Catholicism, and finally to support of Orthodoxy. These shifts make it clear (1) that by and large governmental policy was becoming more favorable to the Orthodox, (2) that governmental policy was probably not dominated by religious but by political motives, and (3) that with the exceptions of the support of Catholicism by Jagailo and Vitovt, support of Catholicism in 1447 by Casimir and support of union by Casimir in 1458, and support of union and of Catholicism by Alexander from 1499 or 1500 to 1503, the policy of the government toward Orthodoxy did not parallel the policy of the Catholic Church.

The political and economic position of the Orthodox Church within the Lithuanian-Russian state was inferior to that of the Catholic Church, but tended to improve toward the end of the fifteenth century.

As in rights granted to nobles, so in rights granted the Orthodox Church, there were two types: (1) economic, and (2) political and politico-economic.⁸⁹ During the fifteenth century these were nine categories of economic rights found in grants to nobles: (1) water rights, (2) milling rights, (3) hunting and fishing rights, (4) land rights, (5) forest rights, (6) honey rights, (7) subsoil rights, (8) labor rights, and (9) revenue rights.⁹⁰ In the period 1377-1430 grants to the Orthodox Church reveal only three of these: (1) water rights—lakes and streams, (3) hunting and fishing rights—beaver runs, and (9) revenue rights—income.⁹¹ These grants were made by regional princes, all Olgerdovichi, prior to 1399, that is, before the regional princes were subordinated to the Lithuanian-Russian state by Vitovt. Two of these grants were to lands in Kiev⁹² and one to lands in Polotsk.⁹³ No grants appear for the years after 1399.

In the period 1430-52 there are no grants to the Church with economic rights either by Svidrigailo or by nobles.

During the reigns of Sigismund Keistutovich and of Casimir grants with economic rights appear from 1436 to 1492.⁹⁴ The categories and specific rights are (3) hunting and fishing rights—beaver runs, (4) land rights—fields, ploughed land, and haying, (8) labor rights—peoples, services, and *danniki*, and (9) revenue rights—income, money, silver tribute, and honey tribute.⁹⁵ Although water rights are mentioned before 1400 they are not now included. Labor rights represent a new category for churchly organizations. The other three categories appeared before 1400.⁹⁶ Grants with economic rights were made, with one exception, by princes most of whom were Olgerdovichi. The exception is a grant by Pan Iuri Iur'evich Zenovevich to the Kievo-Pechersky Monastery in 1486.⁹⁷ An indication of this pan's unusual power is the fact that he later was an official, holding the posts of *namestnik* of Braslavl' in 1495, of Smolensk in 1508, and of Mogilev in 1514.⁹⁸ The geographical locations of the grants are Mstislavl',⁹⁹ Kiev,¹⁰⁰ Slutsk,¹⁰¹ and Kobrin.¹⁰² Grants in the western part of the Lithuanian-Russian state, that is, in Slutsk and Kobrin, appear only from 1487 on. They are the first grants with economic rights in western areas, an indication of a possible change of policy.

The reigns of Alexander and Sigismund, 1492-1514, witnessed a great increase in the number of categories of rights and in the number of rights to be found within each category.¹⁰³ All categories except milling and subsoil rights appear: (1) water rights—lakes, ponds, little ponds, rivers, little rivers, oxbows, wells, streams, sources; (3) hunting and fishing rights—games, beaver runs, sturgeon oxbows, beaver ponds, fish ponds; (4) land rights—fields, ploughed land, haying,

meadows, and shallow river banks (this term may refer to parts of banks out of water at time of low water in fall); (5) forest rights—oak trees, sand-pines, thickets, forests, dense timber forests; (6) honey rights—wild bees, wild hives, hive-land; (8) labor rights—people, inhabitants, services, *grosh* servants, *danniki*, *putnye liudi*, *tiaglye liudi*; and (9) revenue rights—income, money, honey and marten tributes, *diakla*. These grants were made as much by princes as by lesser nobles.

The first land grant to a churchly organization by a Great Prince was that of Sigismund to the Kievo-Nikalaev-Pustynsky Monastery in 1511.¹⁰⁴ Apart from Sigismund only two of the donors ever held official posts. Pan Aleksandr Ivanovich Khodkevich was marshal of Lithuania,¹⁰⁵ and Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky was *namestnik* of Vitebsk from 1492 to 1495.¹⁰⁶ Except for the grant by Khodkevich, which was to land in the *voevodstvo* of Troki, all the grants were to lands and rights in the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state, Mstislavl',¹⁰⁷ Kiev,¹⁰⁸ and Polotsk.¹⁰⁹

In the entire period from 1377 to 1514 there was a general increase in the categories of rights, as well as in the specific rights, granted to the Orthodox Church. These grants were generally by princes, most of whom were Olgerdovichs. They were more common in the east, appearing particularly in Kiev, Mstislavl', and Polotsk. Milling and subsoil rights were apparently never granted to Orthodox church organizations. Until the period 1492-1514 no grants with economic rights were made by great princes.

Political and politico-economic rights also throw some light on the position of the Orthodox Church. Five categories emerged from an analysis of the rights of the nobility: (1) rights of disposition, (2) rights of ownership, (3) rights of improving, (4) judicial rights, and (5) military rights.¹¹⁰ Of these only two appear in grants to churchly organizations, and they appear in several grants throughout the entire period 1377-1514. They are (2) rights of ownership—ruling, being free from damaging actions of the great prince or his agents, being free from payment of tribute, and being free from limitations of ownership in favor of the great prince or his descendants, and (4) judicial rights—judging.¹¹¹ All but three of the grants involve lands in Kiev,¹¹² Mstislavl',¹¹³ and Polotsk.¹¹⁴ Those three are to western lands in the *voevodstvo* of Troki.¹¹⁵ The right to judge was granted only by princes of Polotsk and Mstislavl',¹¹⁶ that is, in lands in the east, just as in grants to nobles.¹¹⁷

The grantors of all charters were usually princes, non-princes appearing only from 1486.¹¹⁸ Of the non-princes, Pan Iuri Iur'evich Zenovievich was to hold office and Pan Aleksandr Ivanovich Khodkevich held office at the time of his grant.¹¹⁹ Of the princes, only Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky had held office before the time of his grant.¹²⁰ None of the grants were made by the ruler of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

Restrictions upon the rights of the Orthodox Church in grants to organizations and individuals of that church reveal more about the position of such organizations and individuals. Restrictions uncovered in grants to nobles are (1) absence of mention of political and politico-economic rights, (2) express prohibitions, and (3) duties.¹²¹

Absence of mention of political and politico-economic rights was common. In no charters are (1) rights of disposition, (3) rights of improving, and (5) military rights mentioned. That meant that Orthodox churches and monasteries

did not enjoy the right of selling or otherwise alienating their lands and of placing new structures thereon and were obliged to perform military service. In many charters throughout the entire period 1377-1514 no political or politico-economic rights are mentioned.¹²² There are many more grants from the reign of Casimir on than from the previous periods, and there are twice as many grants concentrated in the years 1483-1492 and 1505-1512 than in all the rest of the entire period 1377-1514. The grants are concentrated in Mstislavl',¹²³ Kiev,¹²⁴ and Polotsk.¹²⁵ Only from 1479 on do grants appear involving lands in the *voevodstvo* of Troki¹²⁶ and in the Volynia land.¹²⁷ Grants to lands in Volynia appear thus for the first time. Three grants were made by officials or individuals who were to become officials, Pan Olizar Shilovich Kirdeevich, *starosta* of Volodimir, *voevoda* of Lutsk, and marshal of the Volynia land,¹²⁸ Pan Semion Romanovich, *namestnik* of Ovruch',¹²⁹ and Pan Iuri Mikhailovich Montovtovich, *voevoda* of Kiev.¹³⁰ It is probable that Montovtovich was Catholic. Only one other grant was made by a non-prince.¹³¹ The rest of the grants were made by princes, mainly Olgerdovich. One grant was made by the great prince, in 1511.¹³² It must be remembered that grants without political or politico-economic rights mentioned often implied economic exploitation of the lands granted. Consequently such grants reveal not only a limitation upon the political power of the Orthodox Church but also an increase in its economic strength.

Express prohibitions appear in only two grants: one of 1468 by Prince Ivan Iur'evich Mstislavsky provides that peasants on land granted were not to make any use of lands remaining in the possession of the prince and that he would retain the right to share in the exercise of judicial power;¹³³ the other of 1509 by Pan Aleksandr Ivanovich Khodkevich makes only the second of the above provisions.¹³⁴ An implicit prohibition may be inferred from the absence of the word "eternally" in many grants to Orthodox churchly organizations and individuals.

Duties or obligations are never mentioned. The failure to mention release from payment of tributes, a right frequently granted,¹³⁵ probably implies obligations.

A few general conclusions seem inescapable. (1) Grants of land to the Orthodox Church were more frequent in the east, especially in Kiev, Mstislavl', and Polotsk. (2) These grants were most numerous in the reigns of Casimir and Sigismund, and remarkably few were made 1400-40 and 1492-1505. In the reign of Casimir only two appear before 1458 and only two in the late seventies. The rest of the grants of all types during the reign of Casimir were made 1458-68 and 1483-92. (3) Most of the grants were made by princes, most of them Gede-minovich. ¹³⁶ (4) Grants by non-princes occurred only from 1483. Most of such grants were made by officials of the Lithuanian-Russian government. (5) The most common rights granted were land rights, labor rights, revenue rights, rights of ownership, and judicial rights. (6) The number of rights granted in the east was larger than in the west.

A comparison of rights granted in a few charters to individuals and organizations of the Catholic Church reveals that the Orthodox Church was never granted the same rights as the Catholic Church during the period 1377-1514. Nor did it enjoy many rights as early as did the Catholic Church.¹³⁷

The following economic rights were granted: (1) water rights—lakes, ponds, little ponds, swamps, waters, sources, streams, rivers and little rivers, (2) milling

rights—mills and their products, (3) hunting and fishing—fish, game, catches, (4) land rights—fields, ploughed fields, meadows, pastures, shores, (5) forest rights—forests, thickets, oak trees, sand-pine, (6) honey rights—hives, (8) labor rights—services and servitors, (9) revenue rights—income, tolls, tributes.

These rights represent the norm for grants to nobles in the period 1492-1514,¹³⁸ except for the fact that (7) subsoil rights appear in the grants to nobles. Milling rights were never granted the Orthodox Church, and labor rights appear to have been granted it only after 1463; honey rights, after 1501.¹³⁹

Political and politico-economic rights appear in two categories: (1) rights of ownership—having, using, possessing, holding, and (2) rights of improving—converting to own favorable uses. The Catholic Church was not given judicial rights in grants. The fact that the grants are all in the west, Volynia, Vilna, and Samogitia, would tend to confirm the suggestion that judicial immunity was better known in the eastern than in the western part of the Lithuanian-Russian state.¹⁴⁰ The advantage of the Catholic Church lay in rights of improving which were not included in grants to the Orthodox Church.¹⁴¹ In grants to both Catholic and Orthodox institutions the rights of disposition are lacking, as are military rights. It is interesting to note that all of the grants to Catholic organizations were made by great princes.

The position of the Orthodox Church may be said to have been inferior to that of the Catholic Church, for it was granted fewer economic rights and received such rights generally later. In terms of the number of political or politico-economic rights granted its position was about equal to that of the Catholic Church. Whereas the Catholic Church apparently depended upon great princes for grants, the Orthodox Church depended upon princely nobles. The Privilege of 1434 applied to nobles of the Orthodox faith, but clearly not to the Orthodox Church.

In terms of papal policy, of governmental policy, and of political and economic rights, the Orthodox Church's position seems to have improved in the period covered by this study. The improvement was not steady. The coincidence of papal support, and of governmental (even if lukewarm) support, of the idea of oecumenical union with a large number of different types of grants by nobles to the Orthodox Church marks 1458 to 1473 as the first period of real strengthening of the Orthodox Church. The second period of strengthening, 1483-92, coincides with the deterioration in the power-political situation of the Lithuanian-Russian state. The last period of strengthening, from 1503 on, coincides with Lithuanian adjustment to defeat at the hands of Moscow and to subsequent defeats. Two periods are marked as particularly unfavorable to the Orthodox Church from all points of view, 1400 to 1430 (or 1434) and 1499 (or 1500) to 1503.¹⁴²

VII. MOTIVES FOR THE DESERTION OF INDIVIDUAL NOBLES

Between 1377 to 1514 there are two periods during which Lithuanian nobles decided to desert Lithuania and to join Moscow, from 1378 to 1408 and from 1481 to 1508. This does not imply that no Lithuanian nobles made the decision to desert Lithuania at other times but rather that no large number of nobles did.

From 1378 to 1408 the desertion of nobles seems to have had two major causes. The first was competition among members of the Lithuanian ruling family, the Gedeminovichi, for power and position within the Lithuanian-Russian state. The second seems to have been the desire of princes who were not members of the Lithuanian ruling family to retain control over *udeli*, which either had been conquered by the Lithuanian-Russian state or were in the process of being so conquered.

In 1377 Great Prince Olgerd died and was succeeded by Jagailo, the eldest of his sons by his second marriage. Late in the following year, the eldest son by his first marriage, Prince Andrei Polotsky, fled to Pskov, whence he proceeded to Moscow to be received by Dmitri Donskoi, the reigning Muscovite Great Prince. In 1378 there took place an attack by Muscovite troops led by Dmitri's brother Vladimir and Prince Dmitri Koriatovich Bobrok-Volynsky, as well as by Prince Andrei Polotsky, which resulted in the temporary seizure of Trubchevsk and Starodub and surrounding areas and the acquisition of considerable loot. This was the first attack by Moscow on Lithuanian-Russian territory between 1377 and 1514. It is interesting to examine the activities of Prince Andrei Olgerdovich Polotsky in order to determine his motives in joining Moscow. Perhaps the attack on Trubchevsk and Starodub revealed Andrei's motive: he may have sought these areas as compensation for the succession of Jagailo instead of himself to the position of Great Prince. He may have sought also to regain Polotsk by his desertion. If he held Polotsk at an earlier time, he had lost it by 1377 or 1378, for there is no evidence that he was Prince of Polotsk at the time of his desertion.¹ While Jagailo's uncle Keistut was still alive, that is, in 1382 or earlier, Jagailo sent his brother Skirgailo to capture Polotsk, presumably from their brother Andrei. Apparently Keistut had previously controlled Polotsk, for he was angry over Jagailo's action.² As a result his agents induced soldiers in the Lithuanian-Russian army of Skirgailo to desert, forcing Skirgailo to flee Polotsk.³ It is not clear whether Skirgailo had momentarily succeeded in capturing Polotsk in 1382; however, by 1387 Prince Andrei Olgerdovich had lost Polotsk to Skirgailo.⁴ Prince Andrei Olgerdovich also lost Starodub, for Starodub appears under the control of Zvenigorodskys from 1392 on. Once his cousin Vitovt Keistutovich had embarked on an anti-Jagellonian policy, Prince Andrei Olgerdovich was induced to join Vitovt and eventually met his death fighting on the side of Vitovt against the Tatars.⁵

Another brother of Prince Andrei, Prince Dmitri Olgerdovich Briansky, also deserted Lithuania for Moscow in the winter of 1378-1379. "Prince Dmitri Briansky did not stand battle, but left the city with his princes and children and boyars and went to Moscow to the Great Prince Dmitri Ivanovich; the Great Prince received him affectionately and gave him the city of Perislavl' with all tributes (*poshlinami*)."

It is not clear why Dmitri Olgerdovich joined Moscow. Perhaps military pressure forced him to do so. The suggestion has been made that Dmitri Olgerdovich again joined with Moscow in 1389, because in that year his

brothers, Skirgailo and Semion called Lingven, had acquired control of Pskov. Apparently there had been consideration of putting Dmitri in control of Pskov.⁷ Sometime during Vitovt's struggle with Jagailo, Dmitri may have decided to leave Moscow. At any rate, by 1399 he fought on the Lithuanian side, that is, on the side of Vitovt, in the battle at the Vorksla against the Tatars, and was among those who were killed.⁸

Because of the desertion of his brothers, the Princes Andrei and Dmitri, Jagailo was obliged to seek support from other Gedeminovichi. This may explain why more princes did not desert Lithuania for Moscow in order to assure their continued possession of holdings. Now they had less reason to fear that their holdings might be taken over by Jagailo or by his agent, Skirgailo. A case in point was Dmitri Koribut, whose control of Novgorod-Seversk lands was not challenged by Jagailo. It should be noted, however, that Koribut's support of Jagailo in his struggle with Vitovt cost him these lands.

The second motive, the desire to retain control of an *udel'* by a prince not of the ruling family, is revealed by the case of Prince Iuri Sviatoslavovich Smolensky, who joined Moscow in the hope of regaining possession of his patrimony, Smolensk. Smolensk had been under the control of his father, who had been defeated in 1386 by Lithuanian troops. In that battle Sviatoslav died and was succeeded by his son Iuri. Possibly because the oldest daughter of Skirgailo's sister was the wife of Iuri, Skirgailo permitted Iuri to remain in control of Smolensk.⁹ Iuri remained in control of Smolensk until 1395, when Vitovt, now in control of most Lithuanian lands, attempted to expand and take over Smolensk.¹⁰ The loss of Smolensk must have been a shock to Iuri Sviatoslavovich, for he had certainly considered himself an *udel'nyi* prince who was subordinate to the Lithuanian-Russian state, and therefore might have expected to retain his lands.¹¹ Smolensk remained under the control of Lithuanian officials until 1401. At that time Prince Iuri Sviatoslavovich attacked the city, and regained it from Lithuania, killing Prince Roman Mikhailovich Briansky and Vitovt's prefects.¹² Iuri was helped by Prince Oleg Riazansky. Three years later Vitovt, with Koribut, Lingven, and Svidrigailo, attacked Smolensk, apparently early in May. After a seven-week siege the city fell on June 26.¹³ Iuri Sviatoslavovich fled to Moscow with his son apparently prior to the fall of Smolensk.¹⁴ Iuri revealed his motive in fleeing. He asked that he and his son, Feodor, be allowed to become servants of Vasilii I: "The Great Prince ascribes to himself Smolensk as *votchina*, and I serve you, and I will not give myself over to Vitovt."¹⁵ That statement makes it clear that Prince Iuri hoped for Muscovite help in holding on to his patrimony of Smolensk. It appears that Vitovt made use of Iuri's flight to Moscow to get the people of Smolensk to surrender the city to Lithuanian forces. Vasilii I later informed Iuri that Smolensk could not be given to Moscow, since the people of Smolensk had ordered it to be given to Vitovt. In other words, Vasilii did not wish to become embroiled with Vitovt of Lithuania over the city of Smolensk. As a consequence Iuri fled to Novgorod, where he may have remained for two years until a change in Muscovite-Lithuanian relations convinced him that it would be wise to return to Moscow. In 1406 Vasilii I of Moscow changed his policy toward Iuri. Instead of rejecting any understanding with him, he gave him half of the city of Torzhok; the other half belonged to Prince Semion Mstislavich Viazemsky.¹⁶ Unfortunately for Iuri Sviatoslavovich he became enamored of Prince Semion's wife, murdered Prince Semion, carried off Prince Semion's wife and murdered her when she

refused to submit to him. As a consequence any chance of co-operation between Iuri Sviatoslavovich and Vasili I was lost. It is interesting to note that his brother, Prince Gleb Sviatoslavovich, did not feel the same compulsion to join Moscow. This may have been because Vitovt gave Roslavl' to Gleb in 1395.¹⁷ The gift may have served to pacify Gleb, for in 1399 he died fighting on behalf of Vitovt against the Tatars in the battle of Vorksla. Apparently he had remained faithful to Vitovt.¹⁸

In 1406 to 1408, several Lithuanian princes joined Moscow. Some seem to have joined as Gedeminovichs princes in order to guarantee their holding important posts and controlling important lands within the Lithuanian-Russian state, and others, as *udel'nye* princes to protect their holdings. In 1406 Vitovt attacked Pskov, and as a result Vasili I of Moscow entered into war against Lithuania. This step seems to have been the immediate cause of the coming of new supporters from Lithuania. The first was Prince Alexander Ivanovich Olgimuntovich, a Gedeminovich, who was surnamed Neliub. There is no clear-cut evidence on why Alexander chose to join Moscow. His father had been a supporter of Vitovt in Vitovt's struggle with Jagailo.¹⁹ Thereafter Ivan had apparently been active in the Lithuanian government, for he was a member of an embassy conferring with the Teutonic Order in 1398,²⁰ and along with his sons, Andrei and Semion, was among the signers of the act of 1401.²¹

In 1408 Svidrigailo, another son of Olgerd and cousin to Vitovt, came to Moscow to serve Vasili I. He came from Briansk and brought with him an imposing retinue, consisting of Isaki, Bishop of Briansk, Prince Patrikei Narimuntovich Zvenigorodsky, his son Alexander Zvenigorodsky, and grandson Feodor Putivil'sky, Prince Semion Peremyshl'sky and Princes Mikhail Khotevtovsky and Urustai Mensky, as well as several boyars of Chernigov, Briansk, Starodub, Liubutsk, and Roslavl'.

Slowly but surely Vitovt had been taking over the lands of the various princes. It had been his policy, first to get an *udel'nyi* prince to become his vassal. Then Vitovt would transfer the lands of the *udel'nyi* prince to one of his own relatives, a member of the family of Gedemin. Finally Vitovt would retake the land and give it in the charge of a prefect or some other local official. There has been considerable speculation about the motives of these princes in deserting Lithuania. Most likely it was because of dissatisfaction with the policy of Vitovt. But it has been suggested that it might also have been the result of some other immediate crisis.²² It should be noticed that Svidrigailo Olgerdovich had not received any large landholdings. There is no clear indication that Svidrigailo controlled any lands before 1408.²³ In 1408 Svidrigailo acquired Briansk and Starodub.²⁴ It is conceivable that he felt he was acquiring lands of little significance. His acquisition represented the losses of his cousin Prince Alexander Patrikeevich Starodubsky.

The motives of Prince Patrikei Narimuntovich Zvenigorodsky and his son, Prince Alexander Patrikeevich (formerly Starodubsky but at the time of his desertion Zvenigorodsky), emerged more clearly. Prince Alexander Patrikeevich, great-grandson of Gedemin, had been in control of Starodub from 1400.²⁵ It appears that Patrikei, Alexander's father, had control over Starodub from 1392 to 1396.²⁶ Alexander may have had Starodub from 1400 to 1406,²⁷ when he seems to have been involved in a plot to betray Vitovt.²⁸ As a consequence, he was seized but was released the following year.²⁹ Probably his implication in the plot was the reason why Svidrigailo was given Starodub and Briansk, which Alexander had

previously controlled. It is quite possible that Vitovt had hoped to calm that region by putting Svidrigailo in charge of it, for Svidrigailo was an Olgerdovich and therefore more likely to be friendly to Jagailo, his brother, than Alexander Patrikeevich, who, as a Narimuntovich, probably felt no particular love for either Vitovt or Jagailo. Perhaps Alexander's plan of betrayal involved the kidnapping of Vitovt to the Teutonic Order.³⁰ When Alexander was released from prison, he may have returned to the Chernigov-Seversk region, or he may have been released there. In any case, he might have been in a position to communicate with Svidrigailo and to convince him of the wisdom of opposing Vitovt. No doubt any such suggestion would have been rendered more attractive by the fact that there was a war going on between Moscow and Lithuania when Alexander was released from prison, and when he might have been discussing the matter with Svidrigailo. It seems extremely likely that the Zvenigorodsky princes had a stronger reason for deserting Lithuania and joining Moscow than did Svidrigailo, for Svidrigailo betrayed Moscow when the Lithuanian army defeated the Muscovite army late in 1408.³¹ Thus it would seem that Svidrigailo felt that he had the chance of gaining more by co-operating with Lithuania, once Lithuania had demonstrated its military superiority over Moscow. Alexander Patrikeevich and his father Patrikei, however, remained in Moscow, an indication that they did not feel it safe to go back to Lithuania. Alexander had brought with him his son, Feodor, Prince of Putivl', who was probably compelled to go because of his father. Possibly a brother of Alexander, Prince Iuri, was among those who deserted Moscow for Lithuania in 1408.³²

The other princes who joined Moscow were not descendants of Gedemin. About Urustai Mensky little is known. But Prince Semion Peremyshl'sky, also known as Borovsky, and Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Khotetovsky were Riurikovichs who had family connections in the upper Oka region. Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Khotetovsky, the founder of the Khotetovsky line, was probably a cousin of the Kozel'sky princes.³³ Semion Peremyshl'sky may well have married Vasilissa, the daughter of Prince Semion Novosil'sky, in 1404.³⁴ Apparently neither of these men controlled large pieces of land. Mikhail Khotetovsky may well have controlled the town of Khotetov.³⁵ And Prince Semion Peremyshl'sky probably controlled Peremyshl'.³⁶ Both of these princes appear among the supporters of Svidrigailo in 1432 and 1434.³⁷ Thus, although their motives in deserting Lithuania may not have been clear in 1408, they were probably among those princes who after the death of Vitovt felt that it was essential to support Svidrigailo against Sigismund Keistutovich because of the necessity of supporting a prince who would not be too dependent upon Poland. Presumably these two princes, Peremyshl'sky and Khotetovsky, returned to Lithuania with Svidrigailo. To be sure, there is no evidence as to what they were doing in the years immediately following the desertion of 1408.

After 1408 the power of Lithuania was great and that of Moscow was small. Slowly Lithuania reached out beyond the Chernigov-Seversk lands to gain control of the lands beyond the Oka River and particularly of parts of Riazan. Lithuania's power may help to explain the absence of desertions. To be sure, internal friction was building up in the twenties, but Vitovt was able to keep matters under control. It was only after his death that an internal crisis developed. Vitovt then appears to have maintained a substantial control over the lands both of the Gedeminovichs and the *udel'nye* princes who previously had deserted him.

During the later part of the reign of Casimir IV and during the reign of Alexander, 1481-1500, many desertions of Lithuania for Moscow took place. The interim had not seen desertion probably because of the superiority of Lithuania's power: Moscow during much of the reign of Vasilii II was wracked by civil war. A consideration of specific cases of individuals who left Lithuania for Moscow between 1481 and 1500 suggests several reasons for desertion: (1) invasion by Muscovite troops either previous to or at the time of their decision to desert; (2) inadequate protection by the Lithuanian government from such invasion; (3) the desire of an individual to acquire all the lands of his family for himself instead of sharing those lands with his brothers or cousins; (4) the desire to regain land acquired by a brother or a cousin who had previously deserted Lithuania for Moscow in order to get all the family lands; (5) the desire to attack in complete security the lands of a noble who was a neighbor, which could be accomplished only by deserting the Lithuanian state; (6) anger over the loss of holdings to the Lithuanian princely government which had previously sent local officials to govern those holdings and possibly connected therewith fear of the repetition of such action; (7) the desire to regain control over lands to which the Great Prince of Moscow had pressed successful claims; (8) the desire to profit economically through loot which might be taken in expeditions on the side of the greater power; (9) the desire for more important governmental posts, combined with jealousy of those who had gained important posts as a result of shifting from Lithuania to Moscow; (10) religious pressure, fear that the Lithuanian central government would force desertion of the Orthodox Church and acceptance of Catholicism. There were a few less common reasons: (11) fear of punishment for crimes committed in Lithuania, specifically that of plotting against the Lithuanian government; (12) the desire to make the best of having been kidnapped, and thus actually forced into Muscovite service; and possibly, (13) the desire to abandon a wife in Lithuania.

Most of the individuals who took the initiative in deserting Lithuania for Moscow appear to have been either former *udel'nye* princes or Gedeminovichi. That does not mean that no non-princes took the initiative in deserting Lithuania for Moscow. It means that available documentation fails to demonstrate their initiative. Many princes deserted for the same reasons, and it would be fruitless to examine each case in detail; therefore, only four representative cases will be so examined. These illustrate all the motives prompting members of the nobility to leave Lithuania for Moscow—all those, that is, apparent in cases I have examined. Sometimes motives which have already emerged in discussion of land tenure and in discussion of office-holding do not appear in the discussion of the individual cases. When a motive appears for the first time, a reference will be made in a footnote to other princes who deserted or may have deserted for the same reason, and substantiation of such a reference will be included. The four examples cover the main period during which desertion was taking place. They are (1) Prince Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky, (2) Prince Semion Romanovich Mezetsky, (3) Prince Andrei Vasilevich Belevsky, and (4) Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky.

Prince Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky was a Gedeminovich, whose father, Prince Ivan Vladimirovich, was the grandson of Ol'gerd and the holder of Belyi in the Smolensk region as early as 1422³⁸ and a supporter of Svidrigailo.³⁹

In 1481-82 Feodor Ivanovich fled to Moscow⁴⁰ without *votchina*.⁴¹ Apparently

the cause of his flight from Lithuania was the discovery by the Lithuanian government of a plot by Prince Mikhail Olel'kovich of Kiev, Prince Ivan Iur'evich Gol'shansky and Feodor Ivanovich, to assassinate Casimir in order to hand over their lands east of the Berezina River to Moscow.⁴² It is difficult to determine whether the conspiracy was an example of Russian irredentism, an example of disturbed relations between Catholic Lithuania and Orthodox Russia, or just an example of the personal ambitions of a group of princes. There had been evidence of dissatisfaction in Kiev, over the failure to appoint an Orthodox prince in charge of Kiev on the death of Semion Olel'kovich in 1470. Feodor Ivanovich was the first cousin once removed of Semion. Perhaps he plotted out of sympathy for Semion's brother Mikhail, a co-conspirator who had been denied the position of *voevoda* of Kiev after the death of Semion. If so, he plotted against Casimir's advisers, who prevented Casimir from giving Kiev to Mikhail.

Other possible motives, however, appear from an examination of the course of Feodor Ivanovich's career after he came to Moscow.

When he arrived in Moscow, Feodor Ivanovich received two villages as *votchina*—Moreva and Demon—as well as several *volost'* districts.⁴³ It is not clear whether Feodor Ivanovich was given land which belonged to him already and which he brought with him or whether he was given land which had been conquered by Moscow. Moreva, part of the Novgorod land, is located on the Morevka, less than thirty miles from Demon (today Demiansk).

Feodor Ivanovich came without his wife, Anna Semionovna Kobrinskaia.⁴⁴ The fact that he did so seems particularly surprising, especially since a chronicle asserts that he "had just married, slept one night with her, and fled to Moscow."⁴⁵ There is no record of an immediate attempt on the part of Feodor Ivanovich to regain his wife. Certainly his assistance to Ivan III in an attack on Tver, August 21, 1483, could not have been more than indirectly aimed at the goal of regaining his wife.⁴⁶ Finally, on March 9, 1488, Ivan III of Moscow sent Prince Feodor Paletsky to Casimir in Warsaw to seek the release of Princess Bel'skaia. This attempt met with failure.⁴⁷ Possibly Feodor Ivanovich was dissatisfied with his marriage, or it may have been mere coincidence that he had just married before his flight.

Conceivably Feodor Ivanovich foresaw the attack on Tver, and recognized that the location of his land, if he could regain control of it, would put him in a particularly advantageous position to assist in such an attack, and might therefore gain him much greater recognition at the Muscovite court than he had received at the Lithuanian court. There had already been disagreements between Tver and Moscow, particularly over whether Tver was to follow a policy of alliance with Lithuania.

A complaint of 1489 by the Poles reveals another possible motive. Feodor Ivanovich apparently enjoyed looting and laying waste the area around Vitebsk.⁴⁸

Perhaps Feodor Ivanovich suffered as a result of joining Moscow, for on December 27, 1488, Ivan III accused Prince Semion Sokolinsky, a subject of Casimir, of attacking from Toropets and from *volosti* of Novgorod and particularly of killing eight servants of Feodor Ivanovich.⁴⁹

Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky showed himself a faithful servant of Ivan III, revealing in 1493 that Prince Ivan Lukomsky had been sent to Moscow by Casimir for the purpose of killing Ivan III, and that he intended to desert Moscow for Lithuania. For this revelation Feodor Ivanovich was given the job of arresting

Lukomsky and sending him to prison in Galich.⁵⁰ A better reward was his in 1497 when he was affianced to Anna, the daughter of Anna Vasilievna, a princess of Riazan, and the niece of Ivan III. The marriage took place the following January in Riazan.⁵¹ Thereafter Feodor Ivanovich's star rose.

Feodor Ivanovich held several important posts. In 1495 he was first of the *deti boiarskie* in a retinue of Ivan III to Novgorod.⁵² In 1499 he was in charge of the cavalry or probably of the entire main body (or *bol'shoi polk*) of troops, which was sent against Kazan, that is to say, he was the highest military leader, outranking the Muscovite leaders, Prince S. I. Riapolovsky and Iuri Zakharich.⁵³ He did, however, remain below the rank of several others, for example, Dmitri Ivanovich, the grandson of Ivan III, and Feodor Borisovich Polotsky, under whom he served in attack against Smolensk in 1502,⁵⁴ and against Kazan in 1505 or 1506.⁵⁵

The reason for Semion Romanovich Mezetsky's coming to Moscow in 1492⁵⁶ was simple; he was betrayed along with his brother Peter by his brother Mikhail and handed over to Ivan III, who put him in jail in Yaroslavl, and thereafter granted the Mezetsky family *votchina* to Mikhail.⁵⁷ The lands which Mikhail Romanovich seized and which may have formed the basis for the betrayal of his brothers, Semion and Peter, were probably (1) Zhabin, Labodin, Bakino in a southeast-northeast line on the Oka River; (2) due north of Zhabin, the village of Ust'e on the Medyn River; (3) northwest of Ust'e the villages of Boriatin, Sukinichi, Ornery, Meshchovsk, Nemerzki, and Uruga; (4) almost due south of Boriatin the village of Khosttsi on the Zhizdra River; (5) northwest of Oleshnia, Koter on the Kotorianka River, Novoeselo, and Sil'kovichi; and (6) due north of Novoeselo the village of Dubrovka or Dubrovsky court.⁵⁸ He also seized two other towns or villages, Sokolin and Govdyrev or Ogdyrev, which have not been located definitely but are in the general area of the Mezetsky land.⁵⁹

In 1494 Prince Semion Romanovich Mezetsky decided that he wished to serve Ivan III, thus accepting his lot after his seizure by his brother Mikhail.⁶⁰ The insecurity of his holdings may have contributed to his decision. As early as 1487 or 1488 the Mezetsky town of Meshchovsk had been attacked by pro-Muscovite princes, i.e., the sons of Semion Odoevsky, Ivan Vasilievich Belevsky, and Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky.⁶¹ In 1493 it was attacked from Smolensk by the prefect of Smolensk, Pan Iuri Glebovich, and Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and burned.⁶² There may have been a third attack by Ivashko Koshka, an *okol'nichii* of Smolensk.⁶³ A family dispute may have also contributed to his decision. The Mezetsky princes consisted of the grandchildren of Andrei Vsevolodovich Mezetsky—Feodor, Piotr, Vasilii, and Ivan Feodorovich, Mikhail and Semion Romanovich, and Grigorii, Dmitri, Feodor, and Lev Aleksandrovich Boriatinsky.⁶⁴ Piotr Feodorovich decided to return to Lithuania to join his brother Feodor, probably in order to retain his interest in the holdings of the Feodorovich Mezetskys. The treaty of 1494 contained a concession by Lithuania to Moscow of the following Mezetsky lands: Meshchovsk, Ogdyrev, Sil'kovichi, Novoeselo, Nemerzki, Uruga, Bryn', Sukinichi, Ornery, Boriatin, Khosttsi, Oleshnia, Ruka, Labodin, Ust'e, Zhabin, Bakino.⁶⁵ So if Semion returned to Meshchovsk while it was still under Lithuania, as Ivan III said he could,⁶⁶ he discovered that he would lose most of his lands to Moscow and would receive no share or at best a moderate share of those lands under the pro-Lithuanian Feodorovich Mezetskys. Conceiv-

ably Ivan III sent him back to Meshchovsk for the purpose of fomenting discord and bringing about the westward advance of Muscovy.

A further motivation may have been the hope of getting more of the Mezetsky lands through co-operation with Moscow. Lithuania complained on behalf of Prince Piotr Feodorovich Mezetsky that he had bought from his childless uncle, Ivan Andreevich, "the third part of the city of Meshchovsk . . . , and recently Mikhail Romanovich, who served you, took from him all that he bought."⁶⁷ Ivan III answered that his servants Vasilii and Feodor Ivanovich Govdyrevsky complained that their uncle Feodor Feodorovich Mezetsky, surnamed Sukhoi, seized their servant Loban and later took thirty of their peasants from their *votchina*.⁶⁸ Piotr's claim Ivan III dismissed, insisting that the disputed third of Meshchovsk belonged to Mikhail Romanovich Narimuntovich and that Piotr had his "*otchina*, and whatever is not written, all that is ours. . . ."⁶⁹ The argument continued through 1494 without any successful resolution.⁷⁰ Alexander of Lithuania later insisted that Feodor and Piotr Feodorovich had owned Ogdyrev, Oleshmnia, Ruta or Rutsa, Markino [Ivakino], Ust'e, Zhabin, Labodin, Khosttsi, and Diadkovshchina.⁷¹ Such insistence would seem to suggest that Alexander was disputing the right of Mikhail and Semion to continue in possession of those territories, or that those communities had never been handed over to Mikhail and Semion and that they had been attacking in order to get what they felt was theirs.⁷² Inasmuch as this remark of Alexander came on the heels of the attack on Kiev by Mengli Girei, khan of the Crimea, ally of Ivan III of Moscow, it might be assumed that Ivan III took advantage of a Crimean-Lithuanian imbroglio to attack or to permit his Mezetskys to attack lands still under the control of the pro-Lithuanian Mezetskys. Furthermore, Alexander accused Elena Govdyrevskaia, and her brothers, of attacking the *otchina* of the pro-Lithuanian Mezetskys.⁷³ It is probable, then, that the communities mentioned above were at this time in the control of the pro-Muscovite Mezetskys and Govdyrevskys, and that co-operation with Moscow had increased their holdings. Ivan III denied that Mezetsky lands were being attacked by the pro-Muscovite princes.⁷⁴

Andrei Vasil'evich Belevsky came to Moscow late in 1492 or at the beginning of 1493.⁷⁵ At any rate Andrei along with his brother, Vasilii, is counted among those in the Muscovite army as of January 29, 1493.⁷⁶ One cause of his coming appears clear: he suffered attack from princes living under Muscovite rule. His brother, Ivan Vasil'evich, had fled to Moscow sometime between 1487 and 1490, probably nearer the earlier date.⁷⁷ He apparently brought the entire *otchina* of the Belevsky family, the city of Belev.⁷⁸ He may have taken Belev after he had fled to Moscow, for in May, 1491, Casimir presented a complaint of Andrei Vasil'evich Belevsky that his brother Ivan had fled to Moscow, and returned and seized Vasilii Vasil'evich and forced him to promise to serve Ivan III and had taken the *otchina* of Andrei, his boyars, servants, and "black" peasants for himself.⁷⁹ The attack on his *otchina*, and the loss thereof, was probably a motive for Andrei's eventual decision to desert Lithuania.

The inability of Casimir to satisfy Andrei Vasil'evich provided a second motive for his decision to join Moscow. In the argument which developed over Belev, Ivan III insisted that he knew nothing about this seizure by Ivan Vasil'evich Belevsky.⁸⁰ Ivan III argued that the princes had the right to leave Lithuanian service. The document containing these arguments was never delivered because of the death of Casimir, but Ivan's position was made clear there when he insisted,

"These are our servants and with their own *otchinas*." Those *otchinas* belonged neither to Casimir nor to Ivan III, but to the princes themselves. This position was certainly not favorable to any attempt by Casimir to assert his right over lands which were being seized by supporters of Ivan III.⁸¹ The inability of Casimir to protect Belev must have had an effect upon other supporters of Lithuania, for Belev was located a bit south of the area which was coming under Muscovite control during the years 1490 to 1492, being on the Oka River near the Belev River.

A third reason may have been the renewal of hostilities between Moscow and Lithuania in 1492, which might have made it seem impossible that Casimir's successor, Alexander, would succeed in regaining Belev for Andrei Vasil'evich.

A fourth motive may have been the desire to lay waste lands of neighbors. After peace was signed between Moscow and Lithuania in 1494, Alexander of Lithuania sent a mission to Ivan III which on August 29, 1494, complained that the Belevskys, Ivan Vasil'evich and his brothers Andrei and Vasilii, now servitors of the Muscovite Great Prince, had, in co-operation with the Odoevskys attacked Lithuanian lands and laid them waste.⁸² The land which they had attacked was that of the Mezetskys. Ivan III insisted that the Belevsky princes had once ruled the land which they attacked, and that they had entered it on their own volition.⁸³ These arguments may indicate that even while both the Mezetskys and Belevskys were under Lithuania, they had disputed the control of some land, or it might indicate that the Belevskys had entered into a semi-servitor status under the Mezetskys. Again in 1498, Ivan, Andrei, and Vasilii were accused by Alexander not only of having attacked and looted, but also of having gone so far as to cut down trees containing wild hives in order to remove the bees, and of having hunted beaver, and of having seized cattle in land which was not their own.⁸⁴ It should be noted that that charge was in response to a complaint by Ivan Vasil'evich Belevsky that Polish troops which had fought alongside his troops against the Tatars had looted his lands on their way back to Lithuania and even taken some of his people.⁸⁵ Possibly, therefore, Alexander was merely expanding on his earlier charges, and this complaint did not reflect a separate attack by the Belevskys.⁸⁶

Another case from this period of maximum desertion is that of Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky. Prince Semion Ivanovich was a collateral relative of Ivan III, whose father, Ivan Andreevich, had left Moscow for Lithuania after the dynastic struggle to unseat Vasilii II, father of Ivan III. Although Ivan Andreevich seems to have enjoyed a semi-independent status between Moscow and Lithuania, as late as 1449, he was a party on the side of Vasilii in a mutual defense treaty between Vasilii and Casimir against the Tatars, and in that treaty promised to have nothing to do with Vasilii's enemy and competitor for the Muscovite Great Princely throne, Dmitri Shemiakin with whom he had been allied.⁸⁷ On April 14, 1450, he received the city of Briansk from Casimir as *otchina*.⁸⁸ Although the document might indicate that he joined Lithuanian service at that time, he is recorded as fleeing to Lithuania only in 1454. In that year, Metropolitan Iona wrote to Misai, Bishop of Smolensk, that he feared that Ivan Andreevich might harm the Prince of Moscow, Vasilii Vasil'evich the Blind, and might do damage to the *otchina* of other princes as well as to border settlements. Metropolitan Iona heartily condemned the failure of Ivan Andreevich to supply troops for the defense of Christendom—in reality, Muscovite Russia—from an attack by Tatars under

Tsar Sidi-Akhmet.⁸⁹ Fear of retribution for this shortcoming may have caused Ivan Andreevich to make the shift from Moscow to Lithuania.

Perhaps also at times during the 1450's, but certainly from 1461 through September, 1462, Ivan Andreevich attempted to regain his *udeli*, which had been confiscated by Vasilii II. During this attempt, Vasilii II died, and his successor Ivan III agreed to terms in September, 1462. Ivan Andreevich insisted that he wished to be "one with you and not to stay apart from you without your permission." By these words, which, as subsequent developments indicate, meant little more than that Ivan Andreevich and Ivan III would leave each other alone, Ivan Andreevich seems to have got back some of his land.⁹⁰

On April 12, 1465, Ivan Andreevich received from Casimir a Privilege to Briansk in a statement addressed to the boyars of Briansk. This statement is notable for its limitations upon Ivan Andreevich's rights over Briansk. It would seem from the statement that he enjoyed a position somewhere between that of an *otchinnik* and a prefect. "And for him we decree to you [that he is] not to drive you from your possessions nor to take [them] away, and not to enter anything churchly nor take [it] away, and [in] the courts to judge as a whole, as was given you, and [likewise in] his new courts, and to impose no new tolls."⁹¹

In 1483 Ivan Andreevich apparently violated the rights of Pan Bogdan Andreevich Iuchkovich Sakovich, prefect of Polotsk. Bogdan's father had received the *sela* of Danilovichi, Dubrovichi, and Volosovichi from Svidrigailo. Ivan Andreevich seized these *sela* and was ordered by Casimir to return them.⁹² These *sela* were in the *povet* of Gomel', a fact which might serve to indicate that Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky held some power in that region at least by 1483, or that he was attempting to expand his power from Briansk westward to Gomel'. At some time he apparently earned Gomel' and Starodub for service.⁹³

It is uncertain when Ivan Mozhaisky died. In 1493 the complaint was made that he had taken an *otchina* by the name of Belogolovl', a court in the *povet* of Briansk, from the uncle of Semion Aleksandrovich and his son Mikhno. Alexander ordered it returned, but it is not clear, from the document, to whom he addressed that order.⁹⁴

Several reasons appear to have motivated Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky's decision to leave Lithuania for Moscow. The first reason may well have been that he did not come into control of all of his father's lands. Above we have seen that his father held Briansk; however, Semion Ivanovich clearly did not hold Briansk. Several prefects controlled Briansk after the death of his father, Ivan Andreevich—for instance, Ian Zavishenets, 1486-87; Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiatich, 1487-88; Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich, 1492-94; Prince Semion Feodorovich Sokolinsky, 1494; Prince Feodor Ivanovich Zheslavsky, 1494-99; and Pan Stanislav Bartoshevich, 1500.⁹⁵ (The appearance of such Lithuanian prefects would indicate that Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky had died in 1486 or before, at least between 1483 and 1486.) The failure of Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky to inherit Briansk may well have been a reason. In January, 1495, Ivan III displayed some interest in trying to convert him to the Muscovite cause,⁹⁶ but he apparently failed to achieve his goal. Perhaps this attempt resulted from Ivan's realization that the desertion of a prince who controlled a large number of districts was important, and from his belief that Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky might be receptive to advances. One is moved to wonder whether the lands of Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky were in anyone's specific control from the time of Ivan Andreevich's death,

sometime between 1483 and 1486, to 1496. Apparently Semion Ivanovich had some degree of control over Gomel' as early as c. 1488, for it was then that Ivan III launched a complaint against Semion Ivanovich for adding to the tolls on carts collected in Gomel'.⁹⁷ But not until 1496 was Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky officially invested with the lands of his father.⁹⁸

Another reason may have been that Ivan III got hold of some of Semion's lands and that Semion was unable to regain them without joining Moscow. The lands of Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky appear to have included the following: Starodub, Gomel', Chernigov, and Karachov in 1496,⁹⁹ and, in addition, Khotimil' in 1499.¹⁰⁰ He appears also to have controlled the cities of Liubech¹⁰¹ and Popova Gora.¹⁰² In 1499 an argument arose between Alexander and Ivan III. Peter Pleshcheev, Ivan's prefect in Kozel'sk, refused to hand over settlements (Budenskoe and Koshatin) in the *volosti* of Karachov and Khotimil', and two settlements (Khrachov and Koshatin) in Briansk.¹⁰³ Ivan III replied that Peter Pleshcheev was holding the lands because of the havoc wrought on Kozel'sk lands by the people of Semion Ivanovich, but that he would order an evacuation of the settlements.¹⁰⁴ On the one hand Alexander damaged Semion by failing to regain control of the two *volosti* of Karachov and Khotimil', and this may have disappointed Semion Ivanovich. On the other hand, Alexander made the cities of Chernigov and Karachov, which were considered service holding of Semion Ivanovich in 1496,¹⁰⁵ a part of the *otchina* of Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky in 1499.¹⁰⁶ That would mean his son or other heirs could succeed to these lands. The shift in the status of the land may have been compensation or an attempt to compensate for the loss of lands to Moscow—that is, to reduce the effect of the loss of those lands upon Semion Ivanovich's attitude toward continued adherence to Lithuania.

The third reason for Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky to desert Lithuania for Moscow may have been attacks by Muscovite troops upon his land. The year 1500 saw a renewal of hostilities between Moscow and Lithuania. In April of that year, Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and Prince Vasiliĭ Ivanovich Shemiakin decided to leave Lithuania for Moscow.¹⁰⁷ It is possible that Semion Ivanovich was induced to join Moscow because of an attack by Iakub Zakharievich, who left Moscow and took Briansk and then had some sort of conference with Semion Ivanovich and Vasiliĭ Ivanovich Shemiakin.¹⁰⁸ It is more than likely, however, that Semion Ivanovich made the decision to join Moscow before Iakub Zakharievich started his campaign.¹⁰⁹

Still another reason, alleged in the chronicles, was that an attempt was being made to force Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky to join the Catholic church.¹¹⁰

Another motive may have been provided by envy over the rising fortunes of lesser princes who had deserted Lithuania for Moscow. It must not be forgotten that because of their relationship to Ivan III Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and Vasiliĭ Ivanovich Shemiakin probably considered themselves higher-ranking nobles than most of those who had acquired important posts in Muscovite service.¹¹¹ An examination of the improvement in position of many who joined Moscow might indicate the possibility of this motive. It will be necessary to assume in all cases where no mention is made of important posts held under Lithuanian rule that the lesser princes held their only important posts under Moscow. In August, 1492, Dmitri Feodorovich Vorotynsky was in charge of a force attacking Mosalsk.¹¹² He was second in command of the forward element

of Muscovite troops attacking Kazan in September, 1497, but furnished his own troops.¹¹³ In 1492, Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky was the second in command in the forward element in an army under Prince Alexander Vladimirovich Rostovsky.¹¹⁴ On December 25, 1496, troops were sent to Novgorod to fight the Swedes. Ivan and Piotr Borisovich were in charge of the left flank in which all three Vorotynskys, Dmitri and Semion Feodorovich and Ivan Mikhailovich, fought with their own troops.¹¹⁵ In 1500 Ivan fought the Lithuanians as fourth in command of the right flank.¹¹⁶ In August, 1499, Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky was in charge of the main body of troops sent against Kazan, under Prince S. I. Riapolovsky and Iuri Zakharich.¹¹⁷ It is clear from this discussion of Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky that new motives may have emerged for desertion by 1500—the desire to regain lands seized by Ivan III, dissatisfaction with the placing of family lands under Lithuanian prefects, jealousy of the position gained in Muscovite service by princes formerly subordinate to Lithuania, and the desire to avoid pressure to desert the Orthodox Church.

In the winter of 1507-08 Prince Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky arranged the last recorded desertion in the period covered by this study: he, his brothers, Vasilii and Ivan,¹¹⁸ Iakub Ivashentsov, Prince Andrei Kromsky, Sen'ko Zherebiatich,¹¹⁹ and probably Andrei Aleksandrovich Droschch¹²⁰ joined Moscow. This desertion is unusual in that Catholics, the Glinskys, participated. Their motive was apparently related to a struggle for power within the Lithuanian-Russian state. Prince Mikhail L'vovich, descendant of a Tatar family, had embraced Catholicism and risen rapidly in the ranks of Lithuanian officials, becoming prefect of Utsiana in 1498, marshal of the court in 1500, and prefect of Merech in 1501, a position which he lost for the more important post of prefect of Bel'sk in 1505.¹²¹ At the same time his brothers were rising: Prince Ivan L'vovich was prefect of Ozhia and Perelom from 1495 to 1504 or 1505, governor-general of Kiev during 1506-07, and governor-general of Novgorod in 1507,¹²² and Prince Vasilii L'vovich was prefect of Vasiliishki from 1501 or 1502 to 1505 or 1506 and administrator of Brest in 1507.¹²³ Prince Mikhail L'vovich does not seem to have retained his posts in 1507, but instead to have been put in charge of an army which fought the Tatars successfully. Perhaps that change of occupation represented a fulfillment of the desire of Sigismund, King of Poland and Great Prince of Lithuania, to get him away from the seat of Lithuanian power. Perhaps the transfer of Prince Ivan L'vovich from Kiev to Novgorod was aimed at preventing the Glinskys' control of the entire southeastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state in the event that Mikhail should succeed in his campaign against the Tatars which followed that transfer. Sigismund insisted that Mikhail sought to take over the Lithuanian-Russian state and was stopped by the *rada* and by Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky.¹²⁴ Mikhail, in anger or in frustration, killed Zaberezinsky.¹²⁵ The Glinskys lost out in the struggle for power: Mikhail was driven to murder, and his brothers probably feared that his downfall would mean theirs.

The four nobles who apparently accompanied them willingly were probably natives of the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state and thus Orthodox. They may have been supporters of Prince Mikhail and may have concluded that his fall spelled theirs, but it is even more likely that they wished to recover their lands which had been lost to Moscow. Three of these four nobles had one thing in common: they were beneficiaries of Great Prince Alexander. Prince Andrei Kromsky had received lands in Briansk and Roslavl' in 1494¹²⁶ and Radogoshch

and Volkonesk in 1498;¹²⁷ Sen'ko Zherebiatich had received lands in Putivl', including Gorodiskaia and Zholvazhskaia in 1499¹²⁸ and Andrei Aleksandrovich Droshch had received the Chernigov holdings of Prince Piotr Mikhailovich Mosal'sky, including Slobodka and Sherepov, in 1496.¹²⁹ Those grants may have been factors in their failure to desert Lithuania for Moscow at an earlier date, but in 1500 Muscovite expansion had resulted in the loss by Lithuania of the areas of Briansk, Putivl', and Chernigov. Thus those three noble beneficiaries were in the unpleasant position of having had their recent gains snatched from them before they had had an opportunity to experience the fullest advantage therefrom. Desertion to Moscow may well have seemed a way of regaining their lost possessions. The possible motives of Iakub Ivashentsovich must remain unknown, for aside from requests for his return from Moscow and mention of his role as escort to envoys to Lithuania from the Nogai Tatars and as ambassador to Mengli Girei from Lithuania there is no information available about him.

Different possible motives have emerged from a consideration of desertions from the Lithuanian-Russian state to Moscow during the period 1377-1514. They were predominantly political and economic. The nobles who deserted seem primarily to have sought to avoid the loss of economic and political power resulting (1) from changes in the structure of the Lithuanian-Russian state or in the personnel dominant therein, and (2) from the loss of lands to the rising Muscovite state.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Chronologically the first motive for the desertion of Lithuania for Moscow by West Russian nobles or boyars was dissatisfaction with the tendency toward centralization. Such dissatisfaction appeared first among members of the Gedeminovich family which ruled the Great Principality of Lithuania. Prince Andrei Olgerdovich fled to Moscow in 1387, and his brother, Prince Dmitri, deserted Lithuania in 1379. Other members of the Lithuanian ruling family reacted unfavorably to the centralizing policy of Vitovt and fled to Moscow in 1408. Another group, former *udel'nye* princes, apparently resented the expansion of Lithuania and after considering serving Lithuania, decided instead to join Moscow. A case in point is Prince Iuri Sviatoslavovich of Smolensk, who fled to Moscow in 1401. Because of the drive of Vitovt toward centralization, the distinction between the two types of princes tended to break down. The Gedeminovichi, who previously had been regional princes—that is, they had former *udel'nye* princes under them—came more and more to be princes who controlled only their own *otchiny* or *patrimonia* and thus came down to the level of the former *udel'nye* princes. An exception to the general tendency is to be found in the case of the Pinsky princes.

During the course of the fifteenth century fewer and fewer members of the Gedeminovich family held extensive *otchiny*. One of the last to control a vast area was Prince Semion Olel'kovich, who came into control of Kiev and Kamenets, which he held until his death in 1470.

The policy of centralization resulted in an increase in the number of governmental officials at the local level. As early as 1415 Podolia had local officials, and from 1430 on Lutsk had a prefect. In the eastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state the princes saw the coming of prefects generally in the latter part of the reign of Casimir. To be sure Smolensk had its first prefects in 1395, and Kiev had its first governor-general after the death of Semion Olel'kovich. At first the establishment of these officials may not have represented a great loss of influence by the local princes because of the fact that the largest percentage of the local officials were of local origin; however, later, during the reign of Casimir, it probably did represent a loss because there was a tendency for those officials to be imported from a different region, as, for example, Pan Piotr Ivanovich Montygirdovich, governor-general and marshal of the Volynia land, 1486-90, and Iuri Patsoyich, governor-general of Kiev, 1486-89.

Up through 1492 the grants made by the Great Princes of Lithuania were generally made for the benefit of officials of the Lithuanian government—a tendency which would have the effect of reducing the influence of the princes and of increasing the power of officials and thus the degree of centralization of the Lithuanian-Russian state.

Part of the policy of centralization seems to have been an effort to improve the position of the lesser nobles in comparison with that of the greater nobles. Throughout the fifteenth century the economic and politico-economic rights granted to the lesser nobles seem to have been similar to those granted to princes. The effect of such a development would be to reduce the princes to the level of the other nobles. One of the more significant rights was the right to dispose of land. That right was granted by the Privileges. Although there are no examples of grants in which lesser nobles or non-princes took advantage of the right to dispose

of lands with economic and politico-economic rights, nevertheless the direction heralded by the Privileges tended to reduce the princes to the level of the non-princes. After 1492 the lesser nobles were favored by an increase in the number of charters granted to them. The politico-economic rights and the economic rights granted in all charters tended to increase during the fifteenth century. This not only represented a reduction in the power of the central government, that is, a trend counter to that of centralization, but also a reduction in the power of the princes who may have been deprived of some of their rights as the result of the increase in rights to the lesser nobles. Contrary to the general tendency to favor the lesser nobles was the fact that limitations in specific form or in the form of non-mention of rights were more numerous in grants to the non-princely nobles of eastern Lithuania.

As the foregoing mention of increased rights to the nobles of the Lithuanian-Russian state suggests, the trend toward centralization was by no means absolute. On the contrary, there was a strong countertrend toward decentralization, which was eventually to win out. Implicit in that countertrend was not only the grant of increased political and politico-economic rights in the specific land grants but also the extension of the power of the nobility in the privileges. Generally speaking, obligations did not increase and the economic power of the central government was greatly reduced by the exemption from the payment of the *dziakła* and the *serebshchina*. In the eastern areas of the Lithuanian-Russian state after 1492 more and more land grants were given to individuals without governmental connections. Moreover, after 1492, more and more of the local officials representing the central government tended to be drawn from the local nobility.

Thus a reaction against centralization could not have been a major factor in the decision of princes to desert Lithuania and to join Moscow throughout the period 1377-1513. Probably the reaction was strongest in the reign of Vitovt and Sigismund Keistutovich. Resentment toward centralization was a less likely motive for desertion during the reign of Casimir, when various economic rights were granted to specific members of the nobility, and during the reign of Alexander when political power was put increasingly in the hands of the local nobility.

A second reason which may have helped to produce the decision of the West Russian nobles to desert Lithuania for Moscow was the preferred position of Catholicism, but it rarely played a decisive role. Although considerable anti-Orthodox prejudice was evident in the period up through 1430, resentment against the Catholic Church does not seem to have been the primary motive for desertion. During that period, the largest-scale desertion occurred in 1408, when Svidrigailo led a large group of West Russian nobles into the Muscovite camp. The motivation of this desertion appears to have been primarily political—a reaction against centralization. Although Orthodox nobles were excluded in the competition for governmental posts during this early period, they failed to become aroused over that fact. Perhaps that was because most of them were little interested in the posts held by Catholics in Lithuania proper and because they lived in Russian lands only nominally under Lithuanian control and enjoyed a greater degree of self-rule than was the case later in the fifteenth century. With the Privilege of 1434 or perhaps also that of 1432, which granted to the Orthodox nobility rights previously enjoyed only by the Catholic nobility of the Lithuanian-Russian state, reason for resentment against Catholicism was temporarily removed. From 1434 (or 1432) to 1492, however, Catholic officials tended to predominate

CONCLUSIONS

in lands inhabited by Orthodox except in the area under the control of Svidrigailo and in Chernigov-Seversk. In the struggle for office at the local level within the Lithuanian-Russian state, the Orthodox seemed to get a reasonable chance only after 1492. Inasmuch as the tendency toward centralization, stressed above, was accompanied by the tendency to bring in outside officials and since these outside officials were generally from Lithuania proper—that is, Catholics—such a development is not surprising. Inasmuch as the trend toward centralization was also accompanied by a tendency to favor the lesser nobles and since therefore the economic and politico-economic rights of the greater nobility or the princes were generally adversely affected, it would not be surprising if the greater nobles came to resent not only the central government of the Lithuanian-Russian state but also the officials who implemented the policy of that state which granted rights to the lesser nobles. Generally speaking, the grants of economic and politico-economic rights were concentrated in the Catholic west, and thus prior to 1492 tended to be given in greater proportion to governmental officials who were largely Catholic. There is some evidence that specific individuals may have deserted Lithuania for Moscow in 1500 especially because of religious pressure. By and large, however, it does not seem that religious discrimination against non-Catholics could have been an important motive after 1492. With the possible exception of a display of interest in the strengthening of the Catholic Church itself as a result of closer relations with Poland, Alexander, Great Prince from 1492 to 1506, does not seem to have been eager to hurt the princes and lesser nobles of the Russian part of the Lithuanian-Russian state by discriminating against them in Privileges, in land grants, and in appointments to governmental posts. It is possible, however, that a shift in policy around 1492 was not sufficient to check an already developed flow of deserters from Lithuania to Moscow. Perhaps there was a deep-seated conviction that the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state did not intend to deal fairly with non-Catholics, but there is no information to substantiate such an hypothesis.

A third reason for the decision of West Russian boyars to desert Lithuania^③ may have been a feeling that their areas were being treated unfairly in comparison with other areas. It is clear that in Volynia, in particular, Orthodox nobles had a better chance for appointment to posts than had Orthodox nobles in areas farther to the east. Lands to the east were subject to the intrusion of local officials representing the central government at a later date than lands to the west. Most lands to the east acquired such officials only late in the reign of Casimir or during the reign of Alexander. Of the more eastern land, Kiev and Smolensk had the highest percentages of Catholic officials. Smolensk, however, tended to have an overwhelming majority of Orthodox officials in the lesser ranks during the fifteenth century. Interestingly enough, relatively few desertions occurred from the lands of Kiev and Smolensk.

In the area of Chernigov-Seversk and the Upper Oka, officials came later than elsewhere and in some cases were Catholic even during the reign of Alexander. While most lands which formed the Lithuanian-Russian state may have had a reduction in Catholic officials, to the inhabitants of Chernigov-Seversk it may have seemed that there was an increase in the number of Catholic local governmental officials. Their appearance may have motivated people in this region to desert on the grounds of preference shown to Catholics in competition for posts,

even though this motive was probably not valid for the entire Lithuanian-Russian state.

One very distinct differentiation is to be found in the demands for services which appeared in the various territories. The area of Smolensk appears to have been subject to a drive for the exaction of services from 1481 on. Such a drive was evident in the rest of eastern Lithuania at the same time, but by no means to the same degree which was evident in Smolensk. Inasmuch as both in the Privileges and in the land grants obligations to perform services were not being increased, it is quite reasonable to assume that there would have been an unfavorable reaction on the part of those people upon whom obligations were being imposed.

The last major reason for the decision of West Russian nobles to desert Lithuania and join Moscow was a combination of political and military factors, which particularly affected nobles of the Upper Oka region and the area of Chernigov-Seversk. (1) Competition between members of the same local princely families made many opportunists try to take advantage of the rising power of Moscow in an effort to gain control of all the lands of their families. (2) Muscovite policy may well have included encouragement of strife between members of border families as a means of weakening the Lithuanian-Russian state. (3) Perhaps Moscow's growing military power encouraged nobles to consider desertion not only as a way of gaining more lands and even higher offices but also as a means of avoiding eventual conquest. Once Muscovite troops had passed the divide between the Volga-Oka watershed to the east and the Dniepr-Desna watershed to the west, acquisition of lands became much easier. The princes who deserted to Moscow prior to the passage of the divide in 1500 performed a great service for Moscow. They certainly could not have known the extent of Muscovite military power as did those who deserted after 1500. Since Muscovite gains were made after 1500, it seems unlikely that intimidation by Moscow caused desertions prior to that date. Therefore the attention of the nineteenth-century Russian historian, Soloviov, to border disputes was not misplaced.

In summary, neither the emphasis on Catholic pressures on Orthodox nor the emphasis on Muscovite expansionism adequately explains the data available as to motives for desertions. Border disputes and resentment over the failure to acquire posts, over the growing power of the Lithuanian-Russian state in eastern areas, and over favoritism to lesser nobles are primary reasons for the desertion of West Russian nobles.

NOTES

I. INTRODUCTION

1. It is difficult to know exactly what term to use to describe those peoples of Eastern Europe who came under the control of Lithuania. The term "West Russians" is used in this work to describe the ancestors of the Great Russians, Byelorussians, and Ukrainians who lived in areas which formed parts of the Lithuanian state. In Russian historical literature the term "West Russians" has Great Russian nationalistic overtones insofar as its use tends to deny the existence in the fifteenth century of distinctive lines of cultural development in Byelorussia and the Ukraine, as for example the existence of the distinctive ancestor of the Byelorussian language used in the official documents of the Lithuanian court. The term "Ruthenian" has been used by Oskar Halecki to describe West Russians, distinguishing thereby between those who were subject to Lithuanian and Polish influence and those who were subject to Mongol influence. That is not a satisfactory usage, for many of the people under Lithuania were subject to both influences, for example, the people of Kiev.

The terms "Great Russian," "Byelorussian," and "Ukrainian" are unsatisfactory, because they imply the existence of distinct nationalities at a time when the concept of distinct nations was far from clear; indeed it was not until the Time of Troubles that the idea of a Russian (viz., Great Russian) nation became a permanent part of the Eastern European scene.

Consequently, the reader must beware. The term "West Russian" is used here for convenience. "West" refers to the geographical location of the people. "Russian" refers to the fact that they were all descended—to be sure, in varying degrees—from the inhabitants of the Russia or Rus' of Kievan times. If the reader prefers, he might well read "West Rus'" for "West Russia." To write of West Rus'ians, however, seems a bit contrived.

2. V. N. Tatishchev, *Istoriia Rossiiskaia s Samikh Drevneishikh Vremen* I (pt. 2), 373-81, 497, 555-56.

3. N.M. Karamzin, *Istoriia Gosudarstva Rossiiskago*, I, 145-46.

4. In his earliest work, *O proizkhozhdenii Rusi*, particularly pp. 39, 50-55, 176, Pogodin asserted the predominantly Scandinavian origin of the Varangians, whom he viewed as founders of the Russian state. In the work that was the crowning achievement of his career, *Drevniaia Russkaia Istoriia do Mongol'skago Iga*, he devoted the better part of the second volume to an explanation of the role of Byzantine Christianity in Russia. Pogodin stressed the fact that Byzantium was largely responsible for making Russia part of the East rather than of the West.

5. V. O. Kliuchevsky, *Kurs Russkoi Istorii*, II, 1-45.

6. V. B. El'iashevich, *Istoriia prava pozemel'noi sobstvennosti v Rossii*, I, 63.

7. B. D. Grekov and A. Iu. Iakubovsky, *Zolotaia Orda i ee Padenie*, p. 258. Grekov sees the Mongols as a negative influence in the realm of politics.

8. G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*, pp. 333-90.

9. G. V. Vernadsky, *Opyt istorii Evrazii s poloviny VI veka do nastoiashchego vremeni*, pp. 5-8. It should be noted that Vernadsky uses the term "Eurasia" in a special sense as Eastern Europe and Northern Asia.

10. Particularly M. L. Rostovtsev, *Skythien und der Bosporus* (Berlin, 1931), G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* (New Haven, 1943), *Kievan Russia* (New Haven, 1948).

11. S. M. Soloviov, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, V, 1444-54.

12. J. Lelewel, *Histoire de Pologne*, I, 101.

13. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, pp. 60-66.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 189-90.

15. A. E. Presniakov, *Obrazovanie Velikorusskago Gosudarstva*, p. 457.

16. M. S. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi*, IV, 224-36.

17. F. Papée, *Polska i Litwa*, I, 32.

18. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 309.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 359-69.

20. I. Dlugosz, *Opera Omnia*, XIV, 696-98.

21. O. Halecki, "Imperialism in Eastern Europe," *American Slavic and Eastern European Review*, XI, 1-26.

II. GEOGRAPHY AND OFFICES

1. See Appendix A and maps at the back of this book drawn by Professor George F. Jenks, Department of Geography, University of Kansas, Lawrence, on the basis of information supplied by the author: Map I, Lithuanian-Russian State 1430-1514, Map II, Area of Maximum Boyar Desertion, 1492-1509.

2. Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 8-9.

3. See G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*, pp. 235-37, for an interesting discussion of the problem of the origin of the term "Black Russia" and the ingenious hypothesis that it might be derived from the Black Vikings.

4. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, is particularly helpful in tracing the development of the *seim*, or parliament, and the *rada*, or council.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 348-66.

6. I am relying on the work of Matvei K. Liubavsky, "Oblastnoe delenie i mestnoe upravlenie Litovsko-Russkago gosudarstva," which appeared in volumes 162-63 and 166-67 of OISR in the years 1892 and 1893. That work explains the various posts in the local government of Lithuania, the duties pertaining to those posts, and their area of competence. In addition it explains the historical background which brought about the formation of the posts. This work is indispensable to an understanding of the operation of the Lithuanian government.

7. Liubavsky does not mention Minsk, although a *diaklo* is mentioned in Minsk, *LM*, V, #262, 1503. Minsk was part of the administrative jurisdiction of the *voevoda* of Vilna, but could not be considered part of Lithuania proper.

8. Liubavsky at first wrote of the Privilege of 1457. I. V. Iakubovsky, "Zemskie privilei Velikago Kniazhestva Litovskago," *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniia*, vol. 346, p. 247 (March, 1903) concluded that it was first issued in 1447 and then renewed in 1457. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 71, speaks of the Privilege of 1447.

9. Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 359-60.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 420.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 544.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 847.

III. RIGHTS OF THE NOBILITY AS REVEALED IN LAND GRANTS

1. The use of the term "feudal" implies a judgment—namely, that feudalism did exist in Lithuania. The term is used to set up in the reader's mind a distinction between Muscovite and Lithuanian practices. It does not contradict any suggestion that Lithuanian feudalism does not fit standard definitions of Western feudalism. Cf. George Vernadsky, "Russian Feudalism," *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 300-23.

2. *Z*, I, #41.

3. Although the editor of *Akty Otnosiashchiesia k istorii zapadnoi Rossii* has called the above *dogovornaia gramota* (treaty), the contents seem to imply a closer relationship than that presented in another document, also labeled *dogovornaia gramota*, of Vasiliu II, Great Prince of Moscow, and the autonomous princes, Mozhaisky, Vereisky, and Borovsky, with Casimir, August 31, 1449. That treaty provided that (1) Dmitri Shemiaka would be regarded as a common enemy, (2) mutual defense against the Tatars would be undertaken, (3) no signatory would enter another's lands, (4) the neutrality of Novgorod and Pskov would be respected, etc. *Ibid.*, I, #50.

4. *Ibid.*, I, #6.

5. *Ibid.*, I, #32.

6. Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 540-50.

7. *Z*, I, #59.

8. Note order by Casimir to Novoinovichi, Vishtortovichi, Kgintsevichi and Eidikginovichi: "They are not responsible for giving *diaklo* [tribute in kind of produce] from the *volost'* because they perform boyars' service." *DZ*, #14 (1488).

9. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 36.

10. Unfortunately the charter granting Briansk to Ivan Andreevich does not seem to be available. The only document even referring to that grant is a charter of 1450 to the inhabitants of the city of Briansk granted by Casimir in which they were told what rights they possessed, a step necessitated by the grant to Mozhaisky, *Z*, I, #52. Liubavsky's argument is supported by other documents: (1) *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 10, (2) *LM*, IV, #26 (1493), confirmed the purchase

of a piece of land but did not guarantee the same to descendants of the purchaser; (3) Z, I, #89 (1484) did not include the right of inheritance.

11. E.g., Z, I, #6 (1383), grant by Vitovt to Vasili Karachevsky and DZ, #2 (1407), grant by Vitovt to Pan Ilia Viachkevich. Liubavsky's support of the view that the Great Prince of Lithuania had the right to take back land seems to be the result of the influence of Vladimirsky-Budanov, whom Liubavsky cites in that matter (Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 551). Vladimirsky-Budanov asserted that before 1387 land fell to the ruler from whom heirs received it because there was no guarantee of inheritance before 1387 (Vladimirsky-Budanov, *Istoriia*, p. 222). The above-cited Z #6 seems to indicate that Vladimirsky-Budanov's date might be pushed back to at least 1383. Furthermore, it serves to emphasize the validity of Liubavsky's moderate protest that Vladimirsky-Budanov's limit was too rigid, that it failed to allow for a gradual development. Another objection is that Vladimirsky-Budanov's position tends to lead to the false conclusion that the Great Princes of Lithuania acquired complete control of the lands of the *udel'nye* princes who came under their sway before 1387.

12. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 36.

13. See chap. VII, n. 74, pp. 128-29.

14. E.g., Z, I, #78 (1482), #126 (1495). In those two cases the lands were granted to the brother of him who fled to Moscow. In some cases, however, lands were granted to someone else, e.g., Z, I, #194 (1501).

15. *IuZ*, I, #1.

16. This analysis is based on DZ, #2 (1407), #6 (1429), #7 (1430); *IuZ*, I, #1 (1361), #6 (1400), #10 (1408), #11 (1409), #12 (1415), #13 (1418), #15 (1424); #18 (1430); Z #6 (1383); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 1), #1 (1410), VIII (Book 4), #1 (1407), #3 (1430).

17. It is likely that the desire for oak trees was connected with the production of honey, since wild hives were often located in oak stumps and hollows.

18. Z, I, #6 (1383); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 1), #1 (1410).

19. *IuZ*, I, #1, #6, #10, #11 (#15?).

20. E.g. Podolia: Z, I, #6; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 1), #1.

21. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #1, #3; *IuZ*, I, #18.

22. SZ, VII, #1 (1433); *IuZ*, I, #19 (1437), #20 (1438), #21 (1442), #24 (1445), #25 (1446), #37 (1452); Z, I, #36 (1438), #45 (1445); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4 (1437), pt. 4 (1450), #10, pt. 5 (1452); LM, IV, #1, pt. 22 (1450).

23. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pt. 1 (1444).

24. Z, I, #36. Even he is called "pan" later in the text, after the grant was made. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 4, and #10, pt. 5.

25. *IuZ*, I, #21, #24, #25; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4, #5, #6, #10, pt. 4, #10, pt. 5.

26. *Ibid.*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pt. 1.

27. Z, I, #35; *IuZ*, I, #30.

28. *IuZ*, I, #19.

29. This analysis is based on Z, I, #50 (1450), #53 (1450), #54, pt. 1 (1450), #54, pt. 2 (1450); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 3 (1452), #9, pt. 4 (1452), #25, pt. 10 (1476); *IuZ*, I, #28 (1452), #29 (1452); LM, III, #89 (1484).

30. Z, I, #54; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 3 and #9, pt. 4.

31. *IuZ*, I, #28.

32. *Ibid.*, I, #29.

33. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #25, pt. 10.

34. LM, III, #89.

35. Z, I, #53.

36. See Appendix II.

37. *IuZ*, I, #18.

38. A Pan Semashko appears without patronymic on the council of Svidrigailo in 1451. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #7.

39. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #5; *ibid.*, IV (Book 4), #6.

40. *IuZ*, I, #28, #29; Z, I, #53.

41. Z, I, #54; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 3, #9, pt. 4; *IuZ*, I, #29.

42. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 4; *IuZ*, I, #29. Peremyshl', although in Polish holdings, is mentioned here because lands were granted in Peremyshl' and in Vladimir in some documents.

43. LM, IV, #89.

44. Z, I, #53.

45. LM, III, #8 (1492), #20 (1492), #21 (1492), #23 (1493), #24 (1493), #25 (1493), #28 (1494), #29 (1494); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #14 (1493), #10, pt. 8 (without

date), #13, pt. 3 (1496), #22 (1499), #30, pt. 3 (1505), pt. 4 (1509), pt. 1 (1512); *IuZ*, I, #33 (1500), #37 (1502), #38 (1502), #40 (1503), #41 (1505), #42 (1507), #49 (1509), #56 (1510), #60 (1514); *ZII*, #14 (1507), #29, pt. 1 (1507), pt. 3 (1507); *LM*, III, #30 (1497), #31 (1498); *LM*, V, #33 (1494), #58 (1495), #78 (1494), #133 (1496), #146 (1496), #151 (1497), #158 (1497), #167 (1498), #184 (1498), #192 (1499), #197 (1499), #198 (1499), #207 (1499), #209 (1499), #210 (1499), #212 (1499), #214 (1499), #215 (1499), #216 (1498), #220 (1499), #223 (1499), #224 (1499), #227 (1500), #229 (1500), #231 (1500), #233 (n. d.), #234 (1500), #236 (1500), #237 (1500), #238 (1500), #239 (1500), #243 (1500), #244 (1500), #245 (1500), #252 (1503), #258 (1503), #262 (1503), #265 (1503); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #31, pt. 1 (1508) #35 (1512), #36, pt. 1 (1512), #41 (1514); *Z*, I, #121 (1494), #133, pt. 2 (1496), #158 (1498), #163 (1499), #164 (1499), #167 (1499), #171 (1499); *DZ*, #22 (1492), #51 (1496), #63 (1499), #66 (1499), #71 (1501), #80 (1503), #80 (1503), #93 (1505), #95 (1506), #104 (1507), #105 (1507).

46. The last two indicate the degree of detail into which these land grants sometimes go. These two rights appear only in a grant to Prince Feodor Mikhailovich Czartoryski. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 8.

47. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 3, #30, pt. 4; *LM*, IV, #28; *IuZ*, I, #40, #47.

48. *LM*, IV, #21, gives rise to the suspicion that these grants may not have been complete, for it contains the right to any body of water other than a lake. That is the only such reference without a simultaneous grant of a body of flowing water, a river, rivulet or run.

49. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #22; *IuZ*, I #37; *Z*, II, #14, #29, pt. 1, pt. 3;; *IuZ*, I, #45, #49, #56, #60; *LM*, V, #209, #210, #214, #224; *Z*, I, #167, #171.

50. *IuZ*, I, #38; *LM*, V, #262; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #35; *DZ*, #104.

51. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #22; *Z*, I, #14; *IuZ*, I, #37, #45; *Z*, I, #163, #167; *LM*, V, #209, #210.

52. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #22; *Z*, II, #14; *IuZ*, I, #45, #49; *LM*, V, #209, #210, pt. 2, #163, #167.

53. *AluZ*, VII (Book 4), #22, *IuZ*, I, #37.

54. *IuZ*, I, #42, #45.

55. *IuZ*, I, #45, #56.

56. *IuZ*, I, #45, #49, #56; *LM*, V, #220.

57. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #36, pt. 1, #41; *LM*, V, #233.

58. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #41; *LM*, V, #133, #252, #262.

59. *Z*, I, #45 (1445).

60. *Ibid.*, I, #53 (1450).

61. Pan Mikolai Dorkgeovich (*LM*, III, #8) was termed bailiff of Dovkchi, otherwise being mentioned only without title as a litigant (*LM*, IV, #82 [1484]). Olita was called bailiff (*LM*, III, #22[?]); Sen'ko or Semion Polozovich, steward and keeper of the keys of Kiev (*LM*, III, #23; *AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #16; *DZ*, #26; *LM*, V, #59). He held the latter post to 1499 and later became prefect of Ovruch' (see Appendix II). Fedko Grigorievich was called scribe (*LM*, II, #25; *DZ*, #22); from 1495-99 he was prefect of Stoklishki (see Appendix II). Sen'ko Terekhovich was called scribe of one of the most powerful officials, Pan Mikolai Radivil, governor-general of Vilna, chancellor of Lithuania (*LM*, III, #28-34; *DZ*, #48). Gendrik Shliager was called *mytnik* (*IuZ*, I, #33); Mikhail Vasilevich, scribe (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #30, pt. 1); Man'ko Kalusoviskii, scribe (*IuZ*, I, #38); and Alexander Petukha, *khoruzhii* of Polotsk (*ibid.*, #42). Pan Bogdan Senkovich, a recipient of land in Lutsk (*LM*, V, #33), although mentioned without title, had previously been termed *kliuchnik* of Lutsk (See Appendix II). Pan Ivan Semionovich Sopega was called a scribe (*LM*, V, #38, #133). He later became one of the most powerful officeholders in Lithuania, holding among other offices the posts of marshal of Lithuania, *voevoda* of Vitebsk, and *voevoda* of Podliash'e (see Appendix II). Grishko Ivanovich is termed scribe to Great Princess Elena (*LM*, V, #198) and Pan Voitekh Ianovich Klochko, marshal, prefect of Kovno, and *okhmistr* of Great Princess Elena (*ibid.*, #233). During his career he also held the posts of prefect of Utsiana and prefect of Belsk (see Appendix II). Vasko Isakovich was called scribe of the aforementioned Ivan Sopega (*LM*, V, #234); Pan Mikolai Iundilovich, master cook of Great Princess Elena and prefect of Koneva and Dubinich (*ibid.*, #239); Pan Andrei Aleksandrovich, cavalry master of Vilna (*ibid.*, #245). He later became prefect of Zbliane (see Appendix II). Pan Bogush Bogovitinovich was called scribe and prefect of Perelai and then prefect of Dovkchi (*LM*, V, #253; *AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #36, pt. 1). He also held the post of prefect of Zhizhmory (see Appendix II). Bogdan Koreevich (*LM*, V, #262), prior to the grant to him, held the post of prefect (see Appendix II).

Grigorii Isaevich Gromyko, called scribe (*LM*, V, #218), later held the posts of keeper of the keys of Vilna and prefect of Svisloch (see Appendix II). Feodor Ivanovich Ludov was appointed *voit* of Vladimir and Litovizh (*LM*, III, #21; *Z*, I, #121). Pan Vasilii Khrebtovich was termed prefect of Vladimir at the time of his grant (*DZ*, #71), having previously been prefect of Gorukhovo and Zdolbitsa (see Appendix II). Pan Gornostai Romanovich was *namestnik* of Ovruch' (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #14 [1493]; *LM*, #24 [1493]). Ivan Novokreshcheny was appointed *voit* of Minsk (*DZ*, #80. His name, "Newly-Christened," suggests that he may have been a Tatar). Pan Feodor Ianushkovich, mentioned without a post in his grant (*DZ*, #81), held many important posts: prefect of Skerstomon, administrator of Vladimir and of Lutsk, and marshal of the Volynia land (see Appendix II).

Prince Matvei Mikitinich appears in grants to him as prefect of Kniazhichi and Teterin and of Mogilev and Birshtany (*IuZ*, I, #37, #45). Prince Kostiantin Ivanovich Ostrozshy appears in grants to him as governor-general of Troki, hetman, and prefect of Bratslav and Vynitsa, and as administrator of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #23, pts. 4-5; *Z*, I, #29). Prince Ivan Borisovich Glinsky was prefect of Chernigov in the grants he received in 1496 (*Z*, I, #133; *LM*, V, #129), but had lost that post by the time of the grant of 1498 (*ibid.*, #167). Prince Simeon Ivanovich Mozhaisky was granted Chernigov in 1496. See Appendix II). Prince Bogdan Feodorovich Glinsky was prefect of Putivl' (*Z*, I, #158). Prince Konstantin Feodorovich Kroshinsky was called treasurer of Smolensk (*LM*, V, #210). Prince Dmitri Ivanovich Putiata was governor-general of Kiev (*ibid.*, #212), having previously held the posts of prefect of Mchensk, Liubutsk, and Briansk (see Appendix II). Prince Olekhno Vasilevich Glazinich was *okol'nichii* of Smolensk and prefect of Luchin (*LM*, V, #220). Prince Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky appears without office (*ibid.*, #224; *Z*, I, #177), but had previously been prefect of Vitebsk (see Appendix II). Prince Ivan Dashkovich Glinsky was earlier prefect of Cherkassy (*Z*, I, #171; *LM*, V, #214).

62. Ivashko Polozovich (*LM*, V, #158. Semion Polozovich was *kliuchnik* of Kiev in 1497; see Appendix II) and Shchasnyi Polozovich (*DZ*, #93), Prince Vasilii L'vovich Glinsky (*Z*, I, #164; *LM*, V, #196. Prince Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky was *namestnik* of Utsiana in 1496. See Appendix II), Vasilii Semionovich Sopega (*ibid.*, #236 [1500]. Ivan Semionovich Sopega was scribe to Alexander, Great Prince of Lithuania, in 1500. *DZ*, #66 [1499], *Z*, I, #179, pt. 1 [1500], *LM*, V, #234 [1500]), Butrim Iakubovich Nemirovich (*ibid.*, #238. Iakub Ivanovich Nemirovich had been *namestnik* of Briansk and of Brest. *LM*, IV, #12 [1487], #62 [1483], #83 [1483]), Iadviga Iakubovna Nemirovicha (*LM*, V, #243. The above-mentioned Butrim was her brother), Princes Ivan and Timofei Filippovich Kroshinsky (*ibid.*, #184. *DZ*, #63. Prince Konstantin Feodorovich, their uncle, was *kaznachei* of Smolensk. *DZ*, #46 [1497], #55 [1498]; Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #2 [1498]. Prince Timofei Filippovich became *kaznachei* of Smolensk by 1508. See Appendix II), and Princes Vasilii and Andrei Sokolinsky (*IuZ*, I, #47. Semion Feodorovich Sokolinsky was *namestnik* of Briansk, 1492. See Appendix II).

63. *Dvorianin* Iatsko Vasilevich Kopochevskii (*LM*, III, #20), Prince Ivan Dmitrievich Krokotko (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #13, pt. 3), Matvei Mitkovich Ugrinovskiy, a *zemianin* of Lutsk (*ibid.*, pt. 4), Senko and Afanas Terekhovichi and Feodko Golosovich, boyars of Smolensk (*LM*, V, #78), Grin and Semion Ivanovich Nesterevich and Feodor and Afanas Pusushovich, boyars of Smolensk (*ibid.*, #146), Boris, Nikifor, Vasilii, Andrei and Mitko Semionovich, boyars of Smolensk (*ibid.*, #151), Semion Kolontaev, *boiarin* of Briansk (*ibid.*, #192), *Dvorianin* Ivashko Rusinovich (*DZ*, #66, *LM*, V, #215), *Dvorianin* Ivashko Pashkevich (*ibid.*, #223), Pashko Radivonovich Tolokonsky, a boyar of Minsk (*ibid.*, #227), Pan Iuri Andreevich Sologub (*ibid.*, #229). Iuri Andreevich became *namestnik* of Smolensk, 1503. See Appendix II), *Dvorianin* Matsko Grin'kovich (*ibid.*, #265), *Dvorianin* Bokei (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #31, pt. 1), Tomko and Bogush Sachkovich Koilensky (*ibid.*, #35), Esko Ivanovich (*DZ*, #104), Kostiusko Volfromeevich (*ibid.*, #105), Prince Timofei Ivanovich Kapusta (*LM*, V, #216, *DZ*, #51), Prince Semion Mikhailovich Olel'kovich (*Z*, I, #163), Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky (*Z*, I, #167), Prince Feodor Feodorovich Chetvertensky (*IuZ*, I, #60), and Prince Vasilii Mikhailovich Vereisky (*AluZ*, VIII [Book 4], #22; *LM*, V, #209).

64. The earliest charter to a prince during this period is apparently *ibid.*, VIII (Book 4), #13, part 3 (1496).

65. *LM*, III, #24; V, #212, #214; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #14, #16, #41; *Z*, I, #158, #171, II #29; *DZ* #93.

66. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 3, #30, pt. 3, pt. 4, #31, pt. 1, #35, #36, pt. 1; *IuZ*, I, #38, #41, #60; *Z*, I, #121; *Z*, II, #14; *LM*, III, #21; *LM*, V, #33, #215, #223.

67. *LM*, III, #25; *IuZ*, I, #42, #47; *LM*, V, #234; *DZ*, #22, #105.

68. *IuZ*, I, #56; *Z*, I, #163; *LM*, V, #158, #198, #239, #243-45, #252; *DZ*, #25, #71, #104.
69. *IuZ*, I, #37; *LM*, III, #31; *LM*, V, #58, #207, #224, #227, #231, #233, #238, #258, #262, #265; *Z*, I, #158; *DZ*, #66, #80.
70. *LM*, III, #29, #30; *LM*, V, #78, #133, #146, #151, #184, #210, #220, #236; *DZ*, #63.
71. *IuZ*, I, #38.
72. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pt. 1 (1444).
73. *Z*, II, #14.
74. *Z*, I, #147.
75. *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #10 (1512), *IuZ*, I, #59, pt. 1 (1512).
76. *Z*, I, #84, pt. 2 (1486).
77. *Z*, I, #43, pt. 2.
78. This section is based on *IuZ*, I, #72 (1522), #78 (1525), #112 (1543), #117 (1548); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 8 (1526), pt. 11 (1517), #11, pt. 3 (1558), pt. 6 (1559), pt. 7 (1559), pt. 14 (1558), pt. 15 (1558), #24, pt. 2 (1520), #25, pt. 1 (1550), #30, pt. 5 (1538), pt. 6 (1538?), pt. 7 (1540), pt. 8 (1530), pt. 11 (1515).
79. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pts. 3, 6, 14, and 15.
80. *Ibid.*, as above plus #24, pt. 2, #25, pt. 1.
81. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #25, pt. 1.
82. J. Rutkowski, *L'histoire économique de la Pologne* (Paris, 1928), p. 50.
83. *LM*, III, #20 (1492); *IuZ*, I, #45.
84. The term politico-economic is used to denote rights of an economic nature but of political significance, as control of land.
85. This analysis is based on *Z*, I, #14 (1399); *IuZ*, I, #4 (1413), #11 (1409), #13 (1415), #15 (1424), *DZ*, #6 (1429), #7 (1430); *AluZ*, VIII (book 4), #1 (1407).
86. *IuZ*, I, #15; *DZ*, #7; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #1, #3.
87. *DZ*, #6.
88. This analysis is based on *IuZ*, I, #18 (1437), #19 (1437), #20 (1438), #24 (1445), #25 (1446); *Z*, I, #36 (1438), #45 (1445); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4 (1447), #5 (1445-52), #6 (1446?), #7, pt. 1 (1451), #10, pt. 4 (1450), #10, pt. 5 (1452).
89. *IuZ*, I, #19, #24, #25; *Z*, I, #45; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #5, #6, #7, pt. 1, #10, pt. 4 and pt. 5.
90. *IuZ*, I, #18, #19, #24, #25; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4, #5, #6, #7, pt. 1, #10, pt. 4 and pt. 5.
91. *IuZ*, I, #18, #19, #20, #25; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4, #5, #6, #7, pt. 1, #10, pt. 4 and pt. 5.
92. *IuZ*, I, #19, #24, #25; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #5, #6.
93. *IuZ*, I, #19, #24, #25; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #5, #6.
94. *Z*, I, #36, #45; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4, #5, #6, #7, pt. 1, #10, pt. 4 and pt. 5.
95. *IuZ*, I, #18, #24, #25; *Z*, #36; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #4, #5, #6, #7, pt. 1, #10, pt. 4 and pt. 5.
96. *Z*, I, #41 (1442), #49 (1448), #52 (1450), #54 (1450), #63 (1459), #72 (1480), #80 (1483), #81 (1483), #91 (1488), #92 (1488); *IuZ*, #28 (1452), #29 (1452), #30 (1452), #32 (1491); *LM*, III, #1, pt. 5 (1461), #1, pt. 10 (1460); *LM*, IV, #21 (1488), #56 (n. d.), #62 (1483), #63 (1482), #66 (1481), #71 (n. d.); *AluZ*, #9, pt. 3 (1452), pt. 4 (1452).
97. *Z*, I, #91, #92.
98. *IuZ*, I, #28, #29, #30; *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 3, #9, pt. 4.
99. *LM*, IV, #63, #71.
100. *Z*, I, #41, #63, #80.
101. *Z*, I, #52 (Casimir to the people of Briansk re rights of Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky) contains mention of the right to judge which had already been granted. See chap. VI, p. 93.
102. *Z*, I, #63, #80.
103. *IuZ*, I, #29, #32; *Z*, I, #41, #49, #52, #63, #72, #80.
104. *Ibid.*, #28.
105. *Ibid.*, #29.
106. See sections on Novosil'skys, Odoevskys, Vorotynskys, and Mozhaiskys in chap. VII, and especially note 74.
107. This analysis is based on *Z*, I, #119 (1494), #121 (1494), #125 (1494), #130 (1495), #133 (1496), #138 (1496), #139 (1496), #158 (1499), #164 (1499), #169

(1499), #173 (1499), #175 (1499), #181 (1500), #191 (1500), #205 (1503), #218 (1505); *IuZ*, I, #37 (1502), #38 (1502), #40 (1503), #41 (1505), #42 (1507), #49 (1509), #50 (1509), #56 (1510), #60 (1514); *DZ*, #22 (1492), #25 (1494), #66 (1499), #71 (1501), #80 (1503), #81 (1503), #83 (1504?), #86 (1505), #100 (1507), #104 (1507); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 1 (1511), #13, pt. 3 (1496), #22 (1499), #27 (1501), #28, pt. 4 (1507), #30, pt. 13 (1510), #31, pt. 1 (1508), #35 (1512), #36, pt. 1 (1512), #37 (1514), #41 (1514); *LM*, III, #81 (1492), #10 (n. d.), #13 (1493), #15 (1493), #18 (1493), #19 (1493), #20 (1493), #22 (1493), #25 (1492); *LM*, V, #33 (1494), #59 (1495), #78 (1495), #133 (1496), #151 (1497), #155 (1497), #167 (1498), #180 (1498), #197 (1499), #201 (1499), #207 (1499), #209 (1499), #210 (1499), #214 (1499), #215 (1499), #220 (1499), #223 (1499), #224 (1499), #228 (1500), #229 (1500), #230 (1500), #231 (1500), #234 (1500), #237 (1500), #238 (1500), #239 (1500), #243 (1600), #244 (1500), #245 (1500), #246 (1500), #252 (1503), #253 (1501), #254 (1503), #256 (1503), #257 (1504), #258 (1503), #259 (1503), #262 (1503), #263 (1503), #265 (1503).

108. E.g., *IuZ*, I, #37, #38, #45, #56, #60.

109. *LM*, V, #78, #133, #151, #155, #210, #220.

110. *Z*, I, #121.

111. *Z*, I, #130 (1495) is the sole example. It was granted to Prince Alexander Cherkassky.

112. *IuZ*, I, #1 (1361), #10 (1408), #12 (1415), #21 (1442); #33 (1500), #47 (1508), #55 (1510), #57 (1510); *LM*, III, #12 (1493), #14 (1493), #26 (1493), #28 (1494), #29 (1494), #30 (1497), #31 (1498), #32 (1498), #33 (1498), #34 (1497); *LM*, IV, #75 (1482), #85 (1484), #87 (1483), #89 (1484), #92 (1486), #93 (1486), #94 (1486), #96 (1486), #99 (1486), #119 (1487), #122 (1489), #126 (1490); *LM*, V, #3 (1492), #32 (1494), #37 (1494), #39 (1494), #40 (1494), #41 (1494), #45 (1494), #47 (1494), #62 (1495), #64 (1495), #102 (1495), #108 (1495), #117 (1496), #119 (1496), #120 (1496), #121 (1496), #136 (1496), #139 (1496), #146 (1496), #158 (1497), #159 (1497), #160 (1498), #167 (1498), #181 (1498), #185 (1498), #189 (1499), #190 (1499), #192 (1499), #198 (1499), #212 (1499), #216 (1498), #228 (1500), #233 (n. d.), #236 (1500), #248 (1500); *DZ*, #10 (1440-44), #11 (1440-44), #29 (1495), #30 (1495), #31 (1495), #51 (1495); *Z*, I, #6 (1383), #22 (1414-29), #53 (1450), #119 (1494), #125 (1495), #140 (1496), #158 (1498); *Z*, II, #9 (1507), #40 (1508), #56 (1509); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pt. 1 (1444), #13, pt. 3 (1496), #15 (1494), #17 (1495), #18 (1492), #28, pt. 2 (1505-06), #30, pt. 4 (1509), #33 (1509), #38 (1513). This list does not include grants with obligations or duties and/or express prohibitions.

113. *IuZ*, I, #47 (1508), *LM*, V, #228 (1500).

114. *LM*, IV, #75 (1482).

115. *Ibid.*, #85 (1483).

116. *Ibid.*, #92 (1486).

117. *Z*, I, #119 (1494); *LM*, V, #32 (1494).

118. *Ibid.*, #62 (1495); *Z*, I, #125 (1495).

119. *LM*, V, #167 (1498).

120. *Z*, I, #158 (1498).

121. *LM*, V, #212 (1499).

122. *Ibid.*, #216 (1498).

123. *Z*, II, #56 (1509).

124. *IuZ*, I, #57.

125. *Ibid.*, #59; also *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #10.

126. *Z*, I, #22 (1414-29).

127. *DZ*, #6 (1429).

128. *SZ*, VII, #3 (1450).

129. *Z*, I, #49 (1448).

130. *Ibid.*, #52 (1450).

131. *Ibid.*, #139 (1496), #167 (1499).

132. *Ibid.*, #133 (1496).

133. *LM*, IV, #21 (1490), #104 (1488); *LM*, V, #71 (1495); *IuZ*, I, #49, pt. 2 (1509).

134. *LM*, IV, #102 (1487), #110 (1488), #112 (1488), #118 (1486); *LM*, V, #6 (1493), #56 (1495), #177 (1498), #184 (1498).

135. *IuZ*, #10 (1408).

136. *Ibid.*, #12 (1415).

137. *Ibid.*, #15 (1424).
138. Z, I, #36 (1438).
139. *Ibid.*, #45 (1445).
140. LM, III, #1, pt. 5 (1461), #1, pt. 17 (1467), #7 (1492), #26 (1493), #27 (1494), #29 (1494), #34 (1497); LM, IV, #20 (1488), #21 (1488), #57 (n. d.), #74 (1481), #87 (1483), #93 (1485), #94, #96 (1486), #111, #113 (1488), #118 (1486), #119 (1487), #122 (1489), #126 (1490); LM, V, #10, (1494), #39 (1484), #40, #45 (1494), #114 (1495), #119-21, #131, #146 (1496), #159 (1497), #160, #186 (1498), #189, #192, #220 (1499), #227, #234 (1500), #253 (1501), #254, #265 (1503); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #14 (1493), #15 (1494), #28, pt. 3 (1506), pt. 5 (1508), #30, pt. 13 (1510), #32, pt. 2 (1508).
141. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #30, pt. 13 (1510).
142. It should be noted that at the end of the fifteenth century and during the early years of the sixteenth century, charters or privileges were given to various areas or lands of the Lithuanian-Russian state. Those charters confirm rights previously enjoyed. A comparison of the provisions does not reveal that the Smolensk land was at any particular disadvantage. See M. Iasinsky, *Ustavniia zemskiia gramoty litovsko-russkago gosudarstva* (Kiev, 1889), *passim*. Thus it could be argued that the apparent drive for the exaction of services in the Smolensk land is nothing but a reflection of the fact that documents concerning this matter have been preserved in greater numbers for the Smolensk land than for other lands. That would imply, however, that there was a general drive for the exaction of services, an implication which would be contrary to the general tendency to increase the number of rights enjoyed by the nobility of the Lithuanian-Russian state; see Chapter IV, pages 40-46. Thus, it seems more nearly reasonable to assume an intense drive for the exaction of services in the Smolensk region.
143. This analysis is based on *IuZ*, I, #6 (1400), #11 (1409), #13 (1415), #35 (1501), #40 (1503), #52 (1509-24).
144. M. F. Vladimirovsky-Budanov, *Kristomatiia po istorii russkago prava*, II, 43-44.
145. *IuZ*, I, #11.
146. *Ibid.*, #40.
147. *Ibid.*, #6, #35, #52.
148. *Ibid.*, #35, #52.
149. *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5 (1507), #6 (1507), #10 (1512); Z, I, #13 (before 1399), #14 (c. 1399), #28 (after 1420), #31 (1422), #43, pt. 1 (before 1443), pt. 2 (1433), pt. 3 (1443), #62 (1458-59), #65 (1461), #66 (1463), #68 (1468), #72 (before 1480), #82 (1483), #84, pt. 1 (1483), pt. 2 (1486), #86 (1486), #94 (1489), #96 (1489-92), #98 (1492), #99 (1492), #111 (1493); *IuZ*, #32 (1491), #35 (1501), #51 (1509), #53 (1509), #58 (1511), #59 (1512), #70, pt. 1 (1519).
150. *IuZ*, I, #53, #59.
151. Z, I, #43, #65, #72, #82, #86, #111; *IuZ*, I, #58, #70, pt. 1.
152. *IuZ*, I, #53, #59.
153. Z, I, #14, #43, #82; *IuZ*, I, #58, #70, pt. 1.
154. *IuZ*, I, #35, #51, #53, #59, pt. 2.
155. *IuZ*, I, #53 (October 13, 1509).
156. *IuZ*, I, #32.
157. Z, I, #86; *IuZ*, I, #51, #53, #59.
158. Z, I, #84.
159. Z, I, #86.
160. *IuZ*, I, #51, #59, #66; *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, #6.
161. *IuZ*, I, #57.
162. *Ibid.*, #59; also *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #10.
163. This analysis is based on Z, I, #3 (1351), #56 (1445 or later); *IuZ*, I, #40 (1503), #52 (1509-24), #70, pt. 2 (1520), #75 (1524); *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 11 (1517), pt. 12 (1542), #25, pt. 10 (1476), #28, pt. 1 (1504), pt. 2 (1505-06), pt. 3 (1506), pt. 5 (1508), #30, pt. 3 (1505), pt. 8 (1533), pt. 11 (1515), #32, pt. 1 (1510), #32, pt. 2 (1508); SZ, VII, #2 (1445); SZ, VIII, #4 (1517), #5 (1523), #9 (1538).
164. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #25, pt. 10.
165. Z, I, #3.
166. *IuZ*, I, #40.
167. *Ibid.*, #70, part 2. See section on Mstislavsky.
168. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #25, pt. 10 (1476), #10, pt. 11 (1517), #30, pt. 8 (1533).

IV. RIGHTS OF THE NOBILITY AS REVEALED IN PRIVILEGES

1. ZPL, pp. 1-99; MHP, XIV, 9-12; #7, 94-95; #76, 529-31; Appendix #22; ZA, pp. 12-13; Z, I, #67.
2. Vitovt was more than Jagailo's agent but less than a fully autonomous ruler (Pfitzner, *Grossfürst Witold*, pp. 105-13).
3. It should be noted that Skirgailo was acting as Jagailo's viceroy or intermediary.
4. ZPL, p. 1.
5. Avizonis, *Die Entstehung*, p. 105.
6. See chap. III, p. 27.
7. Although Polish historians maintain the theoretical position that the regional princes of Lithuania became vassals of Jagailo as a result of the Union of Krevo and the subsequent pledges of both princes to be faithful to Jagailo and to Hedwig, I am not convinced that those regional princes considered themselves vassals. Among those princes were many like Vitovt who struggled against Jagailo's control of Lithuania. Subsequently many remaining regional princes struggled against centralized control by the Lithuanian government over various regional localities. Thus the interpretation which one gives to the various developments affecting the positions of the regional princes depends upon whether one emphasizes the theoretical aspects or the practical aspects.
8. See chap. VII, p. 94.
9. See chap. III, pp. 29-31.
10. ZPL, p. 5.
11. LLS, p. 29.
12. ZPL, pp. 3-6; MHP, VI, #234.
13. O. Haleki, "Przyczynki genealogiczne do dziejow ukl'adu krewskiego," *Miesięcznik Heraldyczny* (1935), p. 111.
14. ZPL, pp. 3-6.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 7-19.
16. The titles *capitaneus*, *hauptmann*, *namestnik*, *tivun*, however, all appear before this date, indicating the existence of posts in Lithuania before 1413. Krasauskaite, *Die Adelsprivilegien*, p. 21, rejects the possibility of a *starosta* of Samogitia or Lutsk before 1413. The post of *starosta* seems to have emerged later in the fifteenth century.
17. Krasauskaite, *Die Adelsprivilegien*, p. 26, regards this statement as an extension of the right of inheritance granted in the Privilege of 1387 "in the sense that [it] . . . was now completely clear and unambiguously formulated." It seems an even greater extension if one recognizes that the right of inheritance was limited to the upper non-princely nobility in 1387 and that it applied to all freemen in 1413.
18. "Dotalia in bonis et villas quas ex successione paterna, vel concessione nostra perpetua habuerint. . . ."
19. Apparently restricted to the lower nobility, for the term *barones* alone appears.
20. It is difficult to know to whom "our" refers. Is it to Vitovt alone or Vitovt and Jagailo? In view of Vitovt's known desire for a great measure of power, it seems unlikely that he would pledge his subjects' loyalty to Jagailo; however, if Vitovt received a pledge of loyalty from the Polish nobility, it is not impossible.
21. See chap. III, pp. 28-29.
22. ZPL, pp. 21-24.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.
24. MHP, XIV, 523, Appendix #17.
25. *AluZ*, V (Book I), 1-2.
26. MHP, XIV, 529-31, Appendix #22, May 6, 1434.
27. *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #11, pt. 1 (1444).
28. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 69.
29. See O. Halecki, "Litwa, Ruś i Zmudź, jako części składowo Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego," *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-filozoficzny*, LIX, 232-34, and Halecki, *Dzieje Unji*, I, 314-15.
30. MHP, XIV, 9-12, #7, dated May 2, 1447, over a month before Casimir's coronation as King of Poland. Also ZPL, pp. 28-35. The latter is essentially the same, but is slightly less precise in some of its wording. This may well be the version which was renewed in 1457, Krasauskaite, *Die Adelsprivilegien*, p. 39, and I. V. Iakubovskii, "Zemskie privilei Velikago Kniazhestva Litovskago," *ZhMNP*, vol. 346, p. 247. See latter for discussion of best texts.
31. MHP, XIV, 18, #17.

32. Boyars are not specifically included in this article, although they appear in the identical article in 1492. I am inclined to regard this omission, not as proof that boyars did not enjoy rights enjoyed by other nobles, but as proof of confusion over the legal meaning of the word "boyar." The existence of confusion is supported by the following:

(1) Article V of the Privileges of 1447 is the only article which omits *barones* and after *nobiles* appears the term *boiari supradicti*. But boyars were not mentioned in previous articles: *MHP*, XIV, 11. In the text of *ZPL*, p. 31, Article VI (the equivalent of Article V, *MHP*, XIV, 11) appear barons and nobles, with no mention of boyars.

(2) A similar confusion is to be found in the texts of Article X, *MHP*, XIV, p. 11, and of Article XI, *ZPL*, p. 33. These equivalent articles grant freedom from services and particularly from payment of the *serebshchina*. But the first-mentioned text includes the term *boiarorum* and the second does not.

(3) Nobles termed Boyars were not excluded from the right of inheritance in the land grants of Casimir, but were not regularly mentioned as having the right of inheritance in privileges. See above, pp. 39-42.

33. *ZPL*, p. 63, Article XXVIII.

34. Chap. III, pp. 24-26.

35. *Z*, I, #91, #92.

36. *MHP*, XIV, Privilege of 1447, Article XIII.

37. *ZA*, pp. 12-13; *Z*, I, #67; Vladimirsky-Budanov, *Istoriia*, II, 32-42. This code appears under the date February 29, 1492. *ZPL*, pp. 42-44. Krasauskaite, *Die Adelsprivilegien*, pp. 45-46, note 30, speaks of the sudebnik of 1476 but cites *ZPL*.

38. *Ibid.*, pp. 44-46.

39. See chap. III, pp. 24-25.

40. *ZPL*, pp. 58-59 (Articles III and IV).

41. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 62 (Articles XVIII-XXI).

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-64 (Articles XXIII-XXVI and XXX).

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65 (Articles XXIX, XXXIII, XXXVII).

46. *Ibid.*, p. 64 (Article XXXII).

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 64-66 (Articles XXXIV-XXXVI and XL).

48. A repetition of the obligation appearing in the Privilege of 1434. See p. 39.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 63, 65 (Articles XXVIII and XXXVIII).

50. *Ibid.*, p. 62 (Article XXII). It should be noted that Sigismund did make use of Poles in Lithuanian service, much to the dissatisfaction of the Lithuanian nobility.

51. See chap. III, p. 25.

52. *ZPL*, p. 34.

53. See chap. III, p. 28.

54. *Z*, I, #121.

55. *ZPL*, p. 59.

56. *ZPL*, pp. 60-61.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 69 (Article XII).

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 68, 70-71 (Articles VIII, IX, XVI, XVIII).

59. *Ibid.*, p. 70 (Articles XIII, XVII).

60. *MHP*, XIV, 440-41, #423.

61. *Ibid.*, XIV, 458, #441.

62. *ZPL*, pp. 72-76.

63. *ZPL*, p. 79.

64. *ZPL*, pp. 95-96.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

66. *ZPL*, pp. 98-99.

67. Possibly unpublished documents will upset this conclusion, for it is not logical to assume that this right would have gone unused for such a long period of time.

V. LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

1. To spare the reader a host of footnotes which would often duplicate one another, I have compiled Appendix II, which contains the names of all officeholders and purely local rulers mentioned in the text of this chapter and in the chart. Each name is followed by a brief state-

ment about the offices held and the ancestry, religion, and geographical origin of the holder, insofar as such information is available.

2. See Liubavsky *Litovsko-russkii seim*, chap. II, esp. pp. 163-70, 347-83.

3. Pfitzner, *Grossfürst Witold*, pp. 105-13.

VI. THE POSITION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

1. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi, period razdeleniia russkoi tserkvi na dve mitropolii*, Book IV, *Istoriia zapadno-russkoi ili litovskoi mitropolii* (St. Petersburg, 1879), IX, 78.

2. Valois, *Le pape*, II, 351.

3. Gregory XII was Roman Pontiff until 1415, but he was not recognized as Pope by the government or hierarchy of the Lithuanian-Russian state after 1409. It supported the decision of the Council of Pisa to depose Gregory XII and to elect a Conciliar Pope as a step toward unity.

4. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 422-28.

5. VM, I, 748-49, #1015.

6. VM, I, 750-51, #1017. In this document Urban referred to the "King of Lithuania, newly converted." There was no king at this time, but there were two great princes, Keistut and Jagailo. If Jagailo is the great prince in question, if Jagailo was converted to Christianity, and if the branch of Christianity was Orthodox—and this might well be deduced from the apparent concern that an Orthodox bishopric would be established in Lithuania—it is possible to conclude that in 1385 Jagailo was converted to Catholicism, not from paganism as is generally supposed, but from Orthodoxy.

7. ZPL, I, 1.

8. VM, I, 769-71, #1051.

9. VM, I, 775-76, #1046 (1405), II, 21-22, #26 (1418).

10. VM, II, 29, #38 (1424), 32-33, #46 (1426).

11. Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Untergange der Herrschaft des Deutschen Ordens*, V, 639-42.

12. *Codex Diplomaticus*, V, 248, #256.

13. B. Bess, "Johannes Falkenberg O.P. und der preussisch-polnische Streit vor dem Konstanzer Konzil," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XVI, 390, 435 ff.

14. Cf. Valois, *Le pape*, I, xxii-xxvii, for discussion and references.

15. Bess, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

16. Valois, *Le pape*, I, 378-84; II, 34-81; Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, I, 5-16.

17. A. Theiner and F. Miklosich, eds., *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem ecclesiarum Graecae et Romanae*, document #2.

18. VM, II, 41-42, #56.

19. Valois, *Le pape*, II, 174.

20. Ziegler, *Die Union*, pp. 127-31; Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 523-24. See Ziegler, *Die Union*, pp. 97-113, 126, 150-51, for analysis of reasons for failure of the idea of union in Lithuania and in Russia.

21. Valois, *Le pape*, II, 258-64.

22. MHP, XIV, 61, #50.

23. Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, I, 72.

24. The above-cited evidence tends to modify Ziegler's conclusion (*Die Union*, p. 150) that the Turkish threat promoted the idea of union, whereas the Turkish victory in 1453 "destroyed all hope." Apparently hope was dimmed sufficiently to affect papal policy prior to Turkish victory.

25. MHP, XIV, 578-79, App. #71; VM, II, 173-74, #212 (1472); MHP, XIV, 495, #478 (1501).

26. *Ibid.*, XIV, 493, #474.

27. VM, II, 240, #263 (1486); MHP, XIV, 494, #474 (1501).

28. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 393; Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 2, 179-92, 209-16, 232-51, 299-302; Chodyncki, *Kościół prawosławny*, pp. 13-22.

29. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 394; Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 2, 333-41. Chodyncki, *Kościół prawosławny*, pp. 25-26, asserts that Cyprian was pro-Union, a strong statement. Cyprian proposed that a council meet in Russia to consider Union. Whether he did so because of his own conviction of the desirability of Union or as a result of pressure from Jagailo is not known, RIB, VI, #44-45.

30. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 324. The first so to appear was Iakub, Bishop of Vilna, who was the first of the supporters of the Act of Union of 1401 (ZPL, p. 3; MHP, VI,

#233-34). Other bishops were Nicholas, Peter, and Matvei of Vilna, Grigorii of Vladimir, Nikolai of Samogitia, and Andrei of Lutsk.

31. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 59. Liubavsky asserts the contents of only the second half of the above sentence. His limited assertion seems to overlook the fact that there is no evidence either that early Catholic bishops in Lithuania had property rights which identified them with noble landowners or that such men as Iakub were members of Lithuanian noble families. It seems probable that governmental support of the Catholic Church resulted in and was reenforced by the situation which Liubavsky describes.

32. See this chapter, pp. 90-93.

33. Chap. IV, pp. 36-37.

34. Pfitzner, *Grossfürst Witold*, p. 151; his campaigns received papal support. Vitovt was also trying to realize expansionist ambitions in North Russia (Presniakov, *Obrazovanie velikorusskago gosudarstva*, pp. 336-42). To strengthen his argument that Vitovt was trying to get closer to the Orthodox in order to further his expansionist plans, Presniakov (*ibid.*, p. 336) asserts that Vitovt took on the Orthodox name, Alexander, 1391. It should not be overlooked that Vitovt was called Alexander in 1378 by Pope Gregory IX (*VM*, I, 748-49, #1015).

35. Pfitzner, *Grossfürst Witold*, pp. 168-76.

36. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 398-403, Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 2, pp. 368-88. See Chodynicky, *Kościół prawosławny*, pp. 34-41.

37. *PSRL*, XVII, 524 (1413): "And that year Vitovt established the bishopric of Samogitia, and set up the *kostel* of St. Peter in Mednik." Liubavsky asserts that the bishopric of Samogitia was first mentioned 1417 (*Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 58).

38. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

39. Pfitzner, *Grossfürst Witold*, p. 170.

40. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 512-14. Golubinsky expressed doubts that Vitovt seriously considered union between the Eastern and Western Churches (*Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 2, 385-86). Chodynicky stresses the pro-Union activities of Tsamblak and Jagailo but is silent about Vitovt. Insofar as Tsamblak supported Union at the Council of Constance and inasmuch as he was Vitovt's representative, Vitovt must be considered as supporting the idea of union, at least tentatively.

41. *MHP*, VI, #1298.

42. *MHP*, XIV, 503, #5.

43. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 65.

44. *MHP*, XII, #204.

45. *AluZ*, V (Book 1), 1-2.

46. *MHP*, XIV, App. #17, 523-24. See chap. IV, p. 38.

47. *MHP*, XIV, 529-31, App. #22.

48. *MHP*, XIV, 9, #7; *ZPL*, pp. 28-29. The term prelates as beneficiaries of the Privilege appears only in the Latin texts of the Privilege. The Russian texts, Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, pp. 525-28, *Z*, I, #61, were granted to "kniazem, panom, szlachte i mestom." The Russian text in *ZA* mentions prelates as beneficiaries only in Article III in which public trial is promised to all those accused. The obvious conclusion from this difference in beneficiaries in the Latin and Russian texts is that the Catholic hierarchy of Lithuania was granted rights which were denied the Orthodox hierarchy. See chap. IV, p. 40.

49. See note #20, this chapter, Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, 449. Volynia accepted him and he propagandized in Kiev and Smolensk, Bucynski, "Studji z istorii cerkovnoji uniji," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, LXXXV, 34. Chodynicky, *Kościół prawosławny*, p. 49, suggests that Svidrigailo and his protégé, Metropolitan Gerasim (1432-35), supported union: "... he [Gerasim] was a supporter of the Union and supported Svidrigailo in his plans for uniting the churches. Alas in 1435, he was burned in Vitebsk on the order of Svidrigailo for his alleged, i.e. real, part in the plot against him."

50. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens*, p. 103.

51. Valois, *Le Pape*, II, 326.

52. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 97-98.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 106.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

55. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 403-4. To be sure, Gerasim may not have been Metropolitan of all Russia but just of Kiev, but he was the only metropolitan during his tenure of office. He was killed by Svidrigailo in Vitebsk. Chodynicky asserts that Gerasim was Metropolitan of all Russia, contradicting Golubinsky and Hrushevsky (*Kościół prawosławny*, p. 49). Chodynicky's contradiction is no more than an assertion. He has failed to counter Golubinsky's argument

(*Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 1, 416-18) that the evidence supporting the idea that Gerasim was Metropolitan of all Russia is suspect. It stems from Novgorodian and Pskovian Chronicles which were presumably eager to prove that the consecration of Evfirmii as Archbishop of Novgorod by Gerasim was valid. Since previous consecrations had been performed by Metropolitans of all Russia, Gerasim had to be Metropolitan of all Russia. Golubinsky actually leaves the question open in spite of his conclusion that Gerasim was probably only Lithuanian Metropolitan. Efforts to determine the validity of the Chronicles' accounts, e.g., Presniakov, *Obrazovanie, velikorusskago gosudarstva*, p. 395, have not closed the question.

56. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 406.

57. Ziegler, *Die Union*, p. 126.

58. Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, I, 87-89; Markarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IV, 18; Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 1, 503-4; *RIB*, VI, #85-86.

59. *RIB*, VI, #88.

60. See this chapter, p. 90.

61. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 188.

62. Golubinsky, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, II, pt. 1, 533.

63. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 46-47; Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 410; Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, p. 189; Chodynicky, *Kościół prawosławny*, pp. 65-68. See note 3, pp. 66-67, for discussion of authenticity of this letter. Chodynicky regards the letter as a plea for a successful union and the fact that Ivan and Alexander Soltanovich accepted union in 1471 as evidence that they intended to support union by the letter of 1476 which they signed. It is difficult to label the Bel'skys, Viazemsky, Khodkievich, and Mikhail Olel'kovich, other signers, all pro-Union. Bel'sky's and Mikhail Olel'kovich's assassination attempt was a pro-Orthodox act which would not likely be performed by someone in favor of union. Only Khodkievich may have been pro-Union, for there is a grant by Alexander Khodkievich to a monastery, to be good regardless of whether it was of Greek or Roman rite.

64. See this chapter, pp. 90-92.

65. See this chapter, pp. 90-91.

65. *ZPL*, p. 65 (Article XXIX).

67. *Ibid.*, p. 58 (Article II). In contrast to the Privilege of 1447 in which the term "prelates" or its equivalent appears only in Latin texts, the Privilege of 1492 contains the term "prelates" or its equivalents in all texts, including those in Russian.

68. See chap. VII, pp. 100-05.

69. *SRP*, VI (pt. 2), 499 (Bernt Stegmann's *Hanseatische Chronik*).

70. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 81.

71. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, pp. 190-91.

72. *MHP*, XIV, 440-41, #423.

73. *MHP*, XIV, 458-59, #441.

74. *MHP*, XIV, 440-41, #423 (1496), 458-59 #441, 459 #442; *ZPL*, pp. 72-76 (1499).

75. Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, pp. 190-91, asserts a causal relationship between closer relations with Poland and attempts at establishing oecumenical union.

76. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 89-90, Chodynicky, *Kościół prawosławny*, p. 71.

77. *VM*, II, 319, #351.

78. See chap. VII, p. 104, n. 110, p. 132. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 309, repeats and accepts the judgment of Chodynicky that political motives dominated Lithuanian-Muscovite hostilities and that, therefore, religion was a pretext for Muscovite war-making. Possibly Ivan III was pleased to have evidence of Lithuanian efforts to force Orthodox to join the Catholic Church, since that would strengthen his appeal to the Russian Orthodox subjects of the Lithuanian-Russian state. It is not possible to go further and suggest that there were no such efforts. To be sure, the Chronicles which are the primary source for the charge of religious pressure were often written for the glorification of Moscow. It is interesting to note that a variant of the Chronicle of Nikon (*PSRL*, XII, 264) drops mention of religious pressure as a motive for the desertion of Prince Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and Prince Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiakin and tries to make it appear, to the greater glory of Moscow, that the Muscovite general, Iakob Zakharievich, by his campaigns induced their desertions.

79. *Z*, I, 192-93, #168. Kuczynski uses this document to prove that the complaints of Ivan III were improper (*Ziemie*, p. 309). To be sure, Ivan III seems to have begun to complain about religious pressure on Elena in the summer of 1498 (*SRIO*, XXXV, 268, #56, pt. 3), but Ivan III did not complain about general pressure on Orthodox before 1500 (*SRIO*, XXXV, 299-300, #65, pt. 3). Moreover, Kuczynski makes no mention of the gap between April 4, 1499, and July 16, 1503.

80. Z, I, 353-54, #204.
81. MHP, XIV, 493, #474.
82. VM, II, 29 (1424).
82. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 109-10; Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 414.
84. Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 152.
85. See this chapter, pp. 90-91.
86. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 539, asserts: "With the death of Iosif discussion on behalf of union died down." Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 149, speaks of "the tranquil state of Orthodoxy, only rarely violated by the struggle with Latinity, without attempts at union."
87. Z, II, #22.
88. The lack of foundation for Vasilii's charge is substantiated by (1) his failure to repeat it and (2) the absence of mention of persecution in the Chronicles.
89. This discussion is different from the discussion on rights in chap. III (pp. 29-31) in that the latter had as its goal clarification of the rights of nobles as indicated in their grants to churchly organizations whether by nobles or by the Great Prince.
90. See chap. III, pp. 18-19.
91. This section based on RIB, II, #2 (1362-92); Z, I, #7 (pre 1386), #13 (pre 1399). There is a fourth document, RIB, II, #17 (1403), which is a grant to the Church of St. John of Gorodko, near L'vov in Galicia. Although it is outside the limits of the Lithuanian-Russian state, this grant might deserve consideration because it was made by Svidrigailo Olgerdovich, a Lithuanian prince. If it were included in the grants to churchly organizations reflecting Lithuanian practices, for that reason, then, it would be necessary to add a fourth category, (4) land rights with specific right of haying.
92. RIB, II, #2; Z, I, #7.
93. *Ibid.*, I, #13.
94. This section is based on Z, I, #66 (1463), #68 (1468), #72 (pre 1480), #86 (1486), #98, #99 (1492); *IuZ*, I, #32 (1491); #230 (1487). Z, I, #68 also appears as ALM, I, #21. #111 (1483) (incorrectly dated 1493. Donor dead at this time, *IuZ*, I, #32).
95. Honey tribute is the closest to honey rights. Churchly organizations do not seem to have been granted control over bees or hives, however, during this period.
96. If the grant by Svidrigailo, RIB, II, #17, is included.
97. Z, I, #86.
98. Z, I, #66, 68.
99. Z, I, #72, 86.
100. Z, I, #98, 99.
101. *IuZ*, I, #32, 102, 230.
102. Z, I, #111.
103. This section is based on *IuZ*, I, #35 (1501), #51 (1509), #53 (1509), #58 (1511), #59 (1512); Z, II, #21 (1507); *AluZ*, I, (Book 6), #5, 6 (1507), #10.
104. *IuZ*, II, #102.
105. *IuZ*, I, #53.
106. *IuZ*, I, #35, #58; Z, II, #21.
107. *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, 6.
108. *IuZ*, I, #59, II, #102.
109. *IuZ*, I, #51.
110. See chap. III, p. 24.
111. This section is based on RIB, II, #2 (1369-92); Z, I, #14 (c. 1399), #43 part 2 (1443), #65 (1461), #68 (1468), #72 (pre 1480), #82, #111 (1483), #86 (1486); ALM, I, #49 (1487); *IuZ*, I, #32 (1491), #35 (1501), #51 (1509), #58 (1511), #59 (1512). The last cited is also printed as *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #10.
112. RIB, II, #2; Z, #72, 86, 111; ALM, I, #49; *IuZ*, I, #59.
113. Z, I, #43, pt. 2, #65, 68, 82; *IuZ*, I, #35, 58.
114. Z, I, #14; *IuZ*, I, #51.
115. *IuZ*, I, #32, 53.
116. Z, I, #14, #43, pt. 2, #68; #82, *IuZ*, I, #58.
117. See chap. III, pp. 24-26, 29-30.
118. Z, I, #86; *IuZ*, I, #51, 53.
119. See this chapter, pp. 90-91, and Appendix II, pp. 142, 154.
120. See this chapter, p. 91, and Appendix II, p. 154.
121. See chap. III, pp. 26-29.
122. This section is based on Z, I, #7 (pre 1386), #13 (pre 1399), #28 (post 1420), #46 (1446), #62 (1458-59), #66 (1463); *IuZ*, I, #228 (1479), #230 (1487); ALM, I, #49

(1487); Z, I, #84 (1483-86), #94 (1489), #96 (1489-92), #98 (1492), #99 (1492), #217 (1505); *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, 6 (1507); Z, II, #21 (1507), #38 (1508), #63 (1511), #82 (1512); *IuZ*, II, #102 (1511).

123. Z, I, #66, 217; Z, II, #21, 63.

124. Z, I, #7; Z, II, #38; *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, 6; *IuZ*, II, #102.

125. Z, I, #13, #62.

126. Z, I, #9, 98, 99; *IuZ*, I, #228, 230.

127. Z, I, #84, 96; Z, II, #82.

128. Z, I, #84. See chap. V, pp. 76-77.

129. *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5. See chap. V, p. 75.

130. Z, II, #38. See chap. V, p. 74.

131. *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #6.

132. *IuZ*, II, #102.

133. Z, I, #68, also printed as *ALM*, I, #21.

134. *IuZ*, I, #53.

135. See this chapter, p. 91.

136. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V, 449, makes essentially the same point although he does not stress Gedeminovich.

137. This section based on *ALM*, I, #3 (1428), #5 (1436), #6 (1437), #78 (1493).

138. See chap. III, p. 21.

139. See this chapter, pp. 90-91, n. 103 above.

140. See chap. III, pp. 24-25.

141. The question of whether the building of Orthodox churches was permitted has been debated. The evidence of the land grants supports those who find a prohibition thereof.

142. See Chodyncki, *Kościół prawosławny*, pp. 107-20 for a comparison of the position of the Orthodox Church under Poland and Lithuania with that under Moscow in which he concludes that generally the Orthodox Church in Muscovite Russia was more tightly controlled by secular authorities.

VII. MOTIVES FOR THE DESERTION OF INDIVIDUAL NOBLES

1. Andrei Olgerdovich is mentioned as Prince of Lithuania, *PSRL*, VII, 60 (1378), and as Prince of Polotsk in subsequent citations. The citation for 1378 refers to this desertion; Kuczynski (*Ziemie*, p. 159), has suggested that Andrei may have gained a great deal as the result of his anti-Jagellonian policy and as a result of the Don battle of Kulikovo of 1380.

2. *PSRL*, XVII, 266, 317, 502.

3. *PSRL*, XVII, 267-69, 318, 503.

4. *MHP*, II, pt. 1, #9 (Jan. 28, 1387).

5. *PSRL*, VIII, 73, XVII, 47; *TL*, p. 451.

6. *PSRL*, VIII, 34, XXV, 200-01.

7. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 163, based on Kolankowski, I, 47. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 154, demonstrates clearly that there were two people named Dmitri Olgerdovich, one named Briansky and the other named Trubetskoi. He gives two arguments: (1) that the chronicles would never use the title of Trubetskoi in place of Briansky because it was inferior to that of Briansky and (2) that in 1380 in the battle of Kulikovo both Dmitri Briansky and Dmitri Trubetskoi are mentioned. New evidence suggests that they may have been the same, for in *TL*, p. 419, Dmitri Olgerdovich Trubetskoi is mentioned as not having fought precisely as Prince Dmitri Olgerdovich Briansky is mentioned as not having fought in *PSRL*, VIII, 34. He is also mentioned as having been given Periaslavl', which is normally considered a gift to Briansky.

8. *PSRL*, VIII, 73, XVII, 47.

9. *PSRL*, XVII, 273, 323.

10. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 168; Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 23; *PSRL*, XVII, 46, 277-78, 327.

11. He supported the Krevo Union in 1386, *MHP*, II, pt. 1, p. 7, #7, July 17, 1386.

12. *TL*, p. 454; *PSRL*, VIII, 75.

13. *TL*, p. 457.

14. *TL*, p. 457, by the order of the description indicates that he fled after the fall of Smolensk. However, *U.*, p. 69, reports a discussion of Smolensk by Vasilii I of Moscow and Iuri prior to its fall.

15. *U.*, p. 69 (1404).

16. *U.*, pp. 69-70; *PSRL*, XVII, 52 (1406).

17. *PSRL*, XVII, 277, 327.

18. *PSRL*, VIII, 73, XVII, 47.
19. *RO*, II, 143, #1198-99 (1390); *MHP*, VI, 20-21, #63-64 (1390). Ivan is mentioned in *MHP*, VI, #63, as the sole adviser to Vitovt.
20. *MHP*, VI, 54, #179 (1398).
21. *MHP*, VI, 73, #234 (1401).
22. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 220. Kuczynski bases his suggestion on the existence of the reference, *PSRL*, XI, 202, to a rebellion in Lithuania and thus comes to the conclusion (p. 222) that it might well have been a flight of conspirators. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, pp. 63-64, avoids clear comment, but presents it more nearly as the desertion of dissatisfied nobles.
23. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 194, suggests that Skirgailo may have ruled Liubutsk sometime between 1402 and 1408. However, he gives no direct substantiation of this suggestion.
24. Dlugosz, *Opera Omnia*, III, 571.
25. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, has conflicting statements; on p. 179 he places Starodub under Alexander from 1401 to 1406, with the statement that Alexander succeeded his father, Patrikei, in the Starodubsky title, and on p. 180 he indicates that the death of Skirgailo in 1397 was responsible for Alexander's gaining control over Starodub.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
27. *Z*, I, #17, 1400. It should be noted that this document is dated December 31, 1400, old style, which would place it in 1401, new style. *PSRL*, VIII, 75, 1402; *MHP*, VI, 136-37, #352, 1406.
28. *MHP*, VI, 136-37, #352, 1406.
29. *MHP*, VI, 150, #369, 1407.
30. The documents from *MHP*, VI, cited in the two above footnotes stress the attempted betrayal by Alexander, and the second document speaks of the Kompthur of Elbing as though he were Alexander's friend, and therefore probably co-conspirator.
31. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 223, based on *PSRL*, VIII, 85, XI, 211.
32. *Noblesse de Russie*, sec. CI, CCC.
33. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, Tabl. geneal., #2.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 137-38.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 65-66. Kuczynski refers to Egzemplarsky for the suggestion that Semion's title had previously been Borovsky, and he points out that in 1433 Semion controlled Borovsky possessions.
37. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 91.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
40. *PSRL*, VI, 35, 233; VIII, 214; XII, 213-14; XVII, 369; XXV, 329; Cyprian, p. 150.
41. *PSRL*, VI, 233.
42. *PSRL*, XII, 233; S., p. 125; Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 228-31. Another example may well be Prince Ivan Glinsky, but there is no mention of reason. *LM*, IV, #74 (1482).
43. *PSRL*, VI; VIII, 214.
44. I have depended upon Papee, *Polska i Litwa*, I, 9, for identification of Anna Semionovna as Kobrinskaia.
45. *PSRL*, VI, 233.
46. *Ibid.*, VI, 237.
47. Bantysh-Kamensky, III, 76; *SRIO*, XXXV, 13.
48. *PMRP*, p. 6; *SRIO*, XXXV, 35-36. That motive may have been one which attracted many princes to leave Lithuanian rule for Muscovite rule. Since at this time Moscow was stronger than Lithuania, it was easier to loot Lithuanian lands from the Muscovite side than to loot Muscovite lands from the Lithuanian side. Other examples of people who may have deserted Lithuania for Moscow in order to have the opportunity to loot are as follows: Prince Vasilii Vasil'evich Belevsky, who was seized in 1491 by his brother Ivan (*ibid.*, XXXV, 58), and then allowed to return to Lithuania. Late in 1492 or 1493, he and his brother Andrei joined Moscow (*RK*, p. 16; *SRIO*, XXXV, 81). On August 29, 1494, a mission from Alexander of Lithuania complained to Ivan III that the Belevskys, including Ivan Vasil'evich who had already joined Moscow, had with the Odoevskys attacked Lithuanian lands and laid them waste (*SRIO*, XXXV, 147). The land which they had attacked had apparently been land which they had previously ruled, for Ivan III referred to it as the *otchina* of the Mezetsky princes which they had ruled for themselves and had entered on their own authority (*ibid.*, XXXV, 152). In 1498, in response to a Muscovite complaint that Polish troops, returning across Russian territory from a fight against the Tatars, had looted the Belevsky lands, Alexander said nothing specific but rather had made a complaint of his own which is quite specific—namely, that the Belevsky

princes had looted Lithuanian lands and had gone so far as to cut down trees containing wild hives in order that they might remove the bees, and had hunted and seized cattle (*ibid.*, XXXV, 267-68). As the above discussion of the Belevskys indicates, the Odoevskys also participated in looting of Lithuanian lands. Perhaps the desire for loot may have been strong among the other enemy countries, for we have the case of that citizen of Smolensk, Anton Kadigrob, who complained that his son went to visit the Odoevsky and the Vorotynsky princes and in Peremyshl' was held captive for three weeks by Ivan Ivanovich Vorotynsky and deprived of five *kop* of a total of seventeen (*ibid.*, XXXV, 4). And from that we might assume not only that Odoevsky princes co-operated but also that Vorotynskys too were interested in a possible gain. It would not be accurate to assume that looting was confined to those who decided to join Moscow. A case in point was the charge made by Ivan III, October 7, 1487, to Timofei Mosalsky, Casimir's envoy to Moscow, that the Odoevsky brothers suffered much at the hands of the pro-Lithuanian Mezetsky princes, whose people invaded and looted their land and carried off their people to Meshchovsk. The Mezetskys and their people apparently received assistance from Prince Semion Vorotynsky and his people (*ibid.*, XXXV, 7-8, 45).

49. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 21. It is questionable whether this complaint should be trusted, for Ivan III specifically states that the complaints which he made at this time offset the complaints made by Casimir. Moreover, Ivan III sought no compensation for these foul deeds supposedly perpetrated upon his subjects. In other words, the charge of killing the servants of Feodor Ivanovich was dropped.

50. *PSRL*, VIII, 225; XII, 235.

51. *Ibid.*, VI, 43, 241; XII, 246.

52. *RK*, p. 20.

53. *RK*, p. 24; *PSRL*, VI, 44, 243; VIII, 237; XII, 250.

54. *RK*, p. 32.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 34; *PSRL*, VIII, 246; XIII, pt. 1, 2.

56. *PSRL* IV, 162; VI, 39, 240; VIII, 227; XII, 235. The date of 1492 is set because of an embassy from Ivan to Alexander, January 5 to February 6, 1493, through which Alexander learned that Mikhail Romanovich Mezetsky had joined Moscow with *votchina* (Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 55).

57. See citations in above footnote. He was not the only one who was brought to Moscow by force. Prince Vasilii Vasil'evich Belevsky was seized by his brother Ivan Vasil'evich, who had joined Muscovite service. He later was released and allowed to return to Lithuania (*SRIO*, XXXV, 58).

58. Zhabin was granted by Casimir to Feodor, Roman, and Ivan in 1456 (*RIB*, XXVII, 65-65). In 1494 it was discussed as an old Mezetsky *votchina* (*SRIO*, XXXV, 137, #24, pt. 21). Labodin was guaranteed to the Mezetskys in 1456 along with Zhabin and was mentioned as a Mezetsky land in 1494. Bakino and Ust'e are in the same documents. Khosttsi is mentioned only in the latter document. Boriatin is mentioned in both citations. Sukinichi is mentioned in the first citation. Ornery is mentioned in both citations. Oren, identified by Liubavsky as Ren' on the Silva River (*Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 55-56) appeared in both citations. Nemerski is mentioned in the first citation but is not discussed directly in connection with the Mezetskys (*SRIO*, XXXV, 118, #24, pt. 9). Uruga is mentioned in the second citation. Oleshnia and Koter are mentioned in both citations, and Novoeselo only in the second. Dobrovka was an earlier possession of the Mezetskys, which may, at this time, have been in the possession of Prince Mikhail Viazemsky (*SRIO*, XXXV, 2-3, #1, pt. 1, early October, 1487). Uruga is probably the same village mentioned as Ruka (Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 148) and as Ruta (*ibid.*, p. 257). It is mentioned as Ruka (Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 55). Neither Liubavsky nor Kuczynski refers to Bakino as a Mezetsky holding, and Kuczynski refers to Khosttsi only in connection with the land of Piotr and Feodor Feodorovich Mezetsky in 1498 (*Ziemie*, p. 257).

59. *Ibid.*, p. 148; *SRIO*, XXXV, 137, #24, pt. 21.

60. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 132, #24, pt. 16 G.

61. *PMRP*, p. 1; *SRIO*, XXXV, 16-17.

62. *RK*, p. 16; Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 59.

63. *SRIO*, XXXV, 81.

64. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, Tabl. gen. #3.

65. *SRIO*, XXXV, 137, #24, pt. 21, Feb. 12, 1494.

66. Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 67.

67. *SRIO*, XXXV, 147.

68. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 154.

69. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 152.

70. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 156.

71. Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 93; SRIO, XXXV, 246-47.

72. It should be noted that Diadkovshchina does not appear in any other document as a Mezetsky holding.

73. Elena does not appear in Kuczynski's tables (*Zemie*, Tabl. Geneal. #3).

74. SRIO, XXXV, 248. An example of a situation similar to that encountered among the Mezetsky princes is discovered among the Vorotynskys. Like Semion Romanovich Mezetsky, Semion Feodorovich Vorotynsky apparently was the object of the envy of his brother, Dmitri. Dmitri is recorded as coming to Moscow with his *otchina*, which apparently included Serpeisk, Byshkovichii, and the *volosti* of Luchino and Nedokhodov (*ibid.*, XXXV, 48, 54). [The date of Dmitri's arrival is not clear. The date of arrival is given as December, 1490 (*PSRL*, VIII, 219, VI, 37). On the other hand, the date December 22, 1489, appears (*SRIO*, XXXV, 40)]. Dmitri may also have brought a few lesser villages or local districts, Mstilavo, Ktsin, Khvostovichi, and Lugan' (*ibid.*, XXXV, 247). Soon after his arrival, Dmitri participated in an attack on his brother Semion and according to a Polish complaint took all Semion's treasure and forced Semion's boyars and princely servitors to serve him, Dmitri (*ibid.*, V, 47-48), a charge which Dmitri denied (*ibid.*, XXXV, 51). On May 9, 1492, Dmitri was accused of invading *volosti* of Briansk and doing some two hundred gross damage (*PMRP*, p. 9). That attack may have been an effort by Dmitri to guarantee continued possession of his lands, for Casimir was disputing Dmitri's father, had received those lands from Casimir. That statement, although probably an error when applied to Kosel'sk, gave Semion Feodorovich an opportunity to become sole heir to his father's lands.

In reality, Casimir's statement is inaccurate. Prince Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky appears to have entered Lithuanian service in 1442 (*Z*, I, #41). On February 5, 1448, he sent a sworn statement to Casimir promising to allow the city of Kosel'sk of which he had been named *namestnik*, at least by 1447 (*ODB*, XIX, 24, #233) to fall to no one but the King (*Z*, I, 61; Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, pp. 5-6). The latter document is dated February 5, 1447, instead of 1448. It is not clear whether Feodor had owned Kosel'sk before 1447. The probability that he did is strengthened by the letter to Casimir in which he asserted that his brother-in-law, Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaisky, had a right to take his own lands away from Moscow and give them to Lithuania, but that he had no jurisdiction over Kosel'sk. In 1455 Feodor received a grant of confirmation of lands for himself, and his children and descendants. A group of towns and villages in the Smolensk district was granted as *otchina*, to wit: Demon, Gorodechno, Uzheperet, Kovyln'ia, Ktsin, Ozeresk, Peremyshl', Loginesk, and Nemchinovskii dvor in the Smolensk land (*Z*, I, 70-71, and *RIB*, XXVII, 52). With the exception of Loginesk, Nemchinovskii dvor, and Uzheperet, which have not been located, the towns and villages mentioned up to this point in connection with Prince Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky lie almost in a straight line stretching along a east-west axis, the easternmost town being Peremyshl' on the shore of Lake Pavtorno near the Oka River, and westward in order are Kosel'sk on the left bank of the Zhizdra River, and Ozersk on both sides of the Diagunka Stream; slightly southwestward is Ktsin; and northwest of Ktsin in a line with Kozel'sk are Gorodechno, Kovyln'ia, and Demon.

Whether Semion had a real possibility of becoming sole heir to his father's lands can be determined by an examination of those lands which Dmitri actually did bring to Moscow. It is interesting to note that outside of Ktsin none of the lands mentioned as having been brought to Moscow by Dmitri were actually in the list of those under the control of his father Feodor L'vovich. Also noteworthy is the fact that the towns and villages brought by Dmitri lie in a continuous line which starts due north of Peremyshl' and ends almost due south of Gorodechno in this order, moving from northeast to southwest: Byshkovichi, Luchino, Nedokhodov, Lugan', Ktsin, Khvostovichi, and Serpeisk. The two lines cross at Ktsin—that is, the line of towns and villages controlled by Feodor L'vovich and the line of towns and villages brought by Dmitri Feodorovich. Semion is credited with bringing Vezhichna, Lychino, Byshkovichi (*SRIO*, XXXV, 152), and Serpeisk (*PSRL*, IV, 151, VI, 240). Semion may have come to try to regain his holdings, for it would seem that he brought very few lands with him. Only Byshkovichi and Serpeisk are mentioned as having been brought by his brother, Prince Dmitri Feodorovich. Thus, one might assume that Dmitri had managed to bring all other Vorotynsky lands not brought by his nephew Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky. If Semion was credited only with bringing Serpeisk, Lychino, and Vezhichna, one might assume that Dmitri had failed to succeed in bringing Serpeisk, that the chronicles were somewhat optimistic in stating that he brought that over to Moscow, but that Dmitri had managed to deprive his brother Semion of the ancestral lands. However, Byshkovichi poses a very difficult problem. Byshkovichi was located north of Peremyshl' and north of Kosel'sk. That fact would seem to indicate either that Dmitri had failed to bring over the lands mentioned in this chronicle and that there was a wide swath of towns and villages which remained under the control of his brother, Prince Semion, or

that Byshkovichi remained faithful to Semion, in spite of the fact that it was surrounded by lands either under the control of Moscow or under the control of princes who had gone over to Moscow—a rather unlikely development. It is quite possible that Dmitri Feodorovich took most of the lands with him. However, the shift does not seem to have been too successful for Semion, for in the Treaty of 1494, Lithuania regained most of the lands which Semion and Dmitri had brought to Moscow. The only lands not regained were the villages of Ozeresk and Peremyshl', which were recognized as the possessions of Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky, Kosel'sk, which became Muscovite, and Lugan', which was assigned to Prince Dmitri Feodorovich Vorotynsky. Dmitri was also conceded lands which may or may not have been in his possession before—Serensk, Lipitsy, and Poryski, all located adjacent to one another and all in the area around Kozel'sk. The Vorotynskys and especially Semion, who probably came over to Moscow in order to make sure of his inheritance, seem to have lost heavily. The Lithuanians had agreed to a treaty which resulted in the existence of a Lithuanian prong north of Kozel'sk and Peremyshl' consisting of Byshkovichi, Luchino, and other villages surrounded on three sides by Muscovite lands. It is no surprise that shortly thereafter Alexander of Lithuania accused Semion Feodorovich of having violated the peace treaty by occupying Byshkovichi (*SRIO*, XXXV, 152). Apparently also Semion Feodorovich attempted to regain his lost lands by attacks on Lychino, Vezhichna, Gorodechno, and Demon (*ibid.*, XXXV, 152; Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 93). The Lithuanians also agreed to the existence of a Muscovite enclave near the divide, in the region of the Reseta River, consisting of Ktsin and Khvostovichi. Possession of this enclave may have helped Moscow pass the divide in 1500 on the renewal of hostilities.

Another example of the same type of problem is encountered in the case of the Odoevskys. In 1474 Semion joined Moscow (*PSRL*, VII, 178). His reasons do not emerge clearly. The activities of his sons, however, may provide a clue. Ivan, Vasilii, and Piotr Semionovich Odoevsky attacked Lithuania in 1487 (*SRIO*, XXXV, 3, #1, pt. 1). That attack was ostensibly directed against Meshchovsk. It may, however, have been for the purpose of securing some Odoevsky lands which were still under Lithuanian control. For on May 9, 1492, Casimir complained that the children of Semion had seized one-half of Odoev from their cousin Feodor Ivanovich Odoevsky and Novosilsky and had carried off his mother (*PMRP*, p. 9). In a document never delivered, the Muscovite Odoevskys denied this charge, but insisted that Ivan, the eldest of the Semionovichi, was entitled to the "great rule" which Feodor refused to give him. Ivan III insisted that Alexander order Feodor to regulate matters with his brother—that is, cousin—and that should Feodor prove unwilling, Alexander should appoint deputies to decide the case (*SRIO*, XXXV, 65). Feodor's holdings apparently extended westward, for he was in control of Dorogobuzh as late as the spring of 1494 (*ibid.*, XXXV, 141). Finally in 1494 the Muscovite Odoevskys gained control of Odoev and of some *volosti* attached thereto, to wit, Ozeresk, Zheremin, Odoevskoe mesttso, and the *volost'* of Peremyshl', which must be distinguished from the town of Peremyshl' (*ibid.*, XXXV, 136, #24, pt. 21). That might seem to indicate that the efforts of the Semionovichi had been crowned with success, that they had achieved the goal of their father and had managed to obtain the land because of which he had left Lithuania for Moscow. However, it is possible that Semion did not have any rights to Odoev because it had been ruled half by his father Ivan Iur'evich and half by the latter's brother, Mikhail (*ibid.*, XXXV, 57, #15, pt. 2).

A third example of the desire to get hold of lands of another member of the family or to get a greater share of family lands by joining Moscow appears in the case of the Viazemsky family. Princes Andrei Iur'evich and Vasilii Iur'evich came to Moscow on January 5, 1493, and February 6, 1493, respectively (*ibid.*, XXXV, 81; Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 55). Soon after their arrival in Moscow, Ivan III issued a request that the land of Andrei Iur'evich be free from any Lithuanian attack (*ibid.*, p. 56). Then in June and July he made a complaint to an ambassador of Alexander insisting that Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and Iuri Glebovich had attacked from Smolensk and emptied the towns and villages and burned the *volosti* of Andrei Iur'evich as well as of others (*SRIO*, XXXV, 106-07). The coming of the Viazemsky princes to Moscow seems to have put Alexander in a rather bad position. Perhaps the quantity of departures by late 1493 was the reason for his complaint. At any rate, on November 6, 1493, in a preliminary agreement between Lithuania and Moscow it was stated, "If the Muscovite [Ivan III] speaks . . . and explains to our Lord [Alexander], then our Lord in his mercy will not put these Viazemsky and Mezetsky princes to death for their departure [for Moscow]" (Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 65). Near the end of 1493 Viazma was lost to Moscow (*PSRL*, IV, 162, VI, 39, 240, VIII, 225-26; *SRIO*, XLI, 187). On February 12, 1494, Moscow and Lithuania agreed that Viazma and its *volosti* should be part of Moscow (*ibid.*, XXXV, 130, #24, pt. 16z). Moreover, it was agreed that those under Lithuanian rule who might previously have had claim to some of these lands would not attempt to regain them. Those persons were the Lithuanian Viazemsky princes, Feodor

Bliudov, Aleksandr Borisovich Khlepen'sky, Roman Fominsky, Iur'i Romeikovich, and Feodor Sviatoslavich, and their brothers and nephews. Vasilii and Andrei Iur'evich do not seem to have gained a great deal, however, for Viazma came directly under Muscovite control and many of the *volosti* of Viazma were assigned to Prince Semion Vorotynsky. This may well have been compensation for the failure of Moscow to help Semion retain his land to the south. Those Viazemsky lands which were handed over to Semion Vorotynsky were Velikoe Pole, Volsta Verkhniaia, Derelishina, Slobodka, Moshchinovichi, and Seredee. Derelishina was specifically mentioned as the *otchina* of Prince Vasilii (presumably Iur'evich) Viazemsky (SRIO, XXXV, 137, #24, pt. 21).

There are several examples of another reason offered for the departure of the Mezetsky princes—to wit, invasion by Muscovite troops of the lands of those who eventually decided to join Moscow. The first such case was the Belevskys, who are discussed in the section in the text of Andrei Vasil'evich.

The same motives seem to have been involved in the case of the Vorotynskys. It has already been stated that Prince Dmitri Feodorovich fled to Moscow in December, 1490. The apparent reason for his flight was an attack by Russian troops. On July 23, 1489, or 1490, a Muscovite attack on some part of Lithuania took place. Russian troops entered the Lithuanian cities of Velikie Luki and Rzhev and imposed a tribute. Moscow also sent generals into the lands of the Vorotynsky princes, especially near those areas held by Dmitri Feodorovich, causing great trouble which resulted in the demand for a frontier court (PMRP, pp. 2-3). There is no evidence that such a court was created. There is evidence that Dmitri may have lost Nedokhodov to the Muscovites at least temporarily (SRIO, XXXV, 3). His brother, Semion, in turn, was probably induced to join Moscow as a result of an attack by Dmitri himself, as a result of Dmitri's seizure of Semion's treasury, and as a result of Dmitri's having forced Semion's boyars and princely servitors to serve him (SRIO, XXXV, 47-48).

The Viazemsky princes may have decided to come to Moscow because of continual attacks by Andrei Vasilievich Mozhaisky, the brother of Ivan III. Apparently as early as 1487 attacks started, for in that year Casimir complained that dues to the extent of twelve Russian rubles collected by Mikhail (presumably Dmitrievich) Viazemsky and eight horses with a cart were seized by Andrei Vasilievich and tolls were improperly levied on the Viazemsky village of Dubrova and on Dubrovskii court (*ibid.*, XXXV, 2-3). A little later Khlepen' and surrounding lands which belonged to Mikhail were attacked from Tver by Prince Vasilii Obolensky, Iur'i Olizalov, and Andrei Istoma (*ibid.*, XXXV, 16, 20). To be sure, there is no record of a direct attack upon the lands of Andrei and Vasilii Iur'evich Viazemsky, who came to Moscow. However, the attacks on the lands of their cousin, Mikhail, may have convinced them that continued adherence to Lithuania would cost them some of their own holdings. That argument is strengthened by the fact that their brother, Mikhail Iur'evich, was mentioned as complaining against a Muscovite attack (*ibid.*, XXXV, 37). Mikhail Iur'evich, however, did not come to Moscow.

Another example of attack from Moscow as a possible reason for the desire to leave Lithuania is uncovered in the Mosal'sky family. Apparently there were three Mosal'sky princes living about the middle of the fifteenth century, Mikhail, Feodor, and Iuri. Mikhail and Iuri were clearly brothers (LM, #26). Piotr and Vasilii, the sons of Mikhail, had lands in Chernigov and southern Smolensk. As a result they were not subject to attacks by Moscow in the 80's and early 90's. However, Prince Timofei Vladimirovich, the grandson of Iuri, and Princes Vasilii and Ivan Feodorovich lived nearer the area of tension, that is, nearer the border between Moscow and Lithuania. Ivan had two sons who were probably among those who, as Ivan III informed Mengli-Girei, came to Moscow from Lithuania prior to August 11, 1500, bringing Mosal'sk (SRIO, XLI, 318, 327, 345). Dmitri and Semion Ivanovich Mosal'sky are the only Mosal'sky princes who appear as servitors of Ivan III. In 1513 they were fifth and sixth in command of the main body of Muscovite troops going from Mosal'sk to Smolensk to participate in an attack on Smolensk (RK, p. 50). Since their father, Ivan, and their uncle, Vasilii, may have been dead by 1493, inasmuch as they are referred to as former co-owners of Ploshchovo (Martynovo) (LM, #26), it is doubtful that they brought Mosal'sk to Moscow in 1500. Dmitri and Semion Ivanovich may have been influenced to come to Moscow by attacks made upon that city. In 1492 Mosal'sk was attacked by Dmitri Feodorovich Vorotynsky (PSRL, VIII, 225). Later in 1492 Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky and the sons of Semion Odoevsky made another attack upon Mosal'sk (SRIO, XXXV, 73). In 1493 Muscovite troops may have burned Mosal'sk (Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 59). This act was carried out by the order of Ivan III (SRIO, XLI, 186, #41). Possibly their cousin, Prince Timofei Vladimirovich, had a share in Mosal'sk. Timofei Vladimirovich probably controlled Oshchitesk, which his father Vladimir had obtained from the latter's uncle, Mikhail (LM, #26). He had also gained control of Nedokhodov in 1457 (*ibid.*,

XXVII, 48). Sometime in 1487 he seems to have lost control either of Nedokhodov or much of the wealth of Nedokhodov to the people of Vasilii Davidovovich Pestnoi and of Ivan Mikhailovich Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky (SRIO, XXXV, 3-36). That *volost* may have not remained in the hands of the latter princes, for Prince Dmitri Feodorovich Vorotynsky was recorded as bringing Nedokhodov with him when he joined Moscow in 1490; so was his brother Semion when he joined Moscow in 1492 (see pp. 127-28 of this note). Nedokhodov may not have represented much of a loss to Timofei, for in 1859 the population was only 18 (SNM, XV [Meshch. 2, 828]). Timofei Valdimirovich may have regained Nedokhodov in 1494 when Prince Semion Feodorovich Vorotynsky was obliged to concede it to Lithuania by the treaty of peace between Moscow and Lithuania (SRIO, XXXV, 136, #24, pt. 21). Another *volost'* of Mosal'sk was Putogin, which apparently belonged to the Mosal'skys although it is not clear to which member or to which branch of the family. It too was returned to Lithuania in 1494.

One might wonder why Prince Timofei Valdimirovich did not join Moscow along with his cousins, particularly if he did have any interest in the family city of Mosal'sk. The reason may be that he had at least nominal posts under Lithuania. In October, 1487, as in March, 1488, and in June, 1489, he was mentioned as Lithuania's envoy to Ivan III (SRIO, XXXV, 1-5, 14-17, 34-39). On the first two occasions he is also mentioned as *okol'nichii* of Smolensk and *namestnik* of Dubrovna. In 1489 he exchanged the title of *namestnik* of Dubrovna for the superior title of *namestnik* of Dorogobuzh, retaining the position of *okol'nichii* of Smolensk.

The same motive—the desire to avoid the effects of Muscovite attacks—may have impelled Princes Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky and Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiachich to join Moscow in 1500. However, it will be more convenient to discuss them together under Semion Ivanovich Mozhaitsky, who will be discussed separately in the main body of the text.

Mezetskys and Vorotynskys seem to have been alone in their desire to engage in an actual attack on their relatives.

75. RK, p. 16; SRIO, XXXV, 81. Since the names of Andrei and Vasilii Belevsky are coupled with that of Semion Feodorovich Vorotynsky in both of these citations, the argument that Semion arrived in Moscow in the summer of 1492 leads to the conclusion that the two Belevsky princes came at that time.

76. RK, p. 17.

77. SRIO, XXXV, 8, 74.

78. PSRL, VI, 37, VIII, 219, XII, 221.

79. SRIO, XXXV, 58.

80. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 60.

81. This same motive is revealed in a letter of explanation which Prince Semion Feodorovich Vorotynsky wrote to Alexander, Great Prince of Lithuania, upon deserting Lithuania. "It was incumbent upon your Father, Our Lord, to protect our *otchina* and defend it from everything, but, Lord, it was known to you that my *otchina* was falling off, and your Father, Lord, our Ruler, did not protect and defend our *otchina* and did not find a city and district for me in place of my *otchina* (Z, I, 106; 124; SRIO, XXXV, 84)."

82. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 147.

83. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 152.

84. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 267-68.

85. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 262.

86. Other examples of this motive have been covered in the discussion on Prince Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky and in footnote #74 above.

87. Z, I, 62-65, August 31, 1449. See L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy*, I, 147.

88. *Ibid.*, I, 67.

89. AI, I, 103-05. According to Cyprian, pp. 4 ff. Ivan Andreevich went to Lithuania with L'vov Vasil'evich.

90. AE, I, 50-51.

91. RIB, XXVII, 123. Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, p. 22, gives word for word, with minor differences in spelling and punctuation, the same grant, dated April 13, 1479. Conceivably the latter is a renewal.

92. Z, I, 101-02, April 17, 1483.

93. Z, I, 192.

94. LM, V, #6, 1493.

95. See chap. V, pp. 72-73.

96. SRIO, XXXV, 168.

97. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 10.

98. Z, I, 163-64. This is the only specific case of a person who, fleeing to Moscow, seems to have had his land taken over by Lithuanian *namestniki* or who did not succeed in inheriting

his father's lands. There may have been many others in this position, but an examination of the documents reveals nothing about them.

99. Z, I, 163-64.
100. Z, I, 196.
101. *SRIO*, XLI, 318, #65, August 11, 1500.
102. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 430, #76.
103. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 282-83.
104. *Ibid.*, XXXV, 287.
105. Z, I, 196; Mukhanov, *Sbornik*, pp. 87-88.
106. Z, I, 192.
107. *U*, pp. 100-01; *PSRL*, XII, 252.
108. *PSRL*, XII, 264.
109. The basis for the suggestion that Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky may have been influenced to join Moscow because of military pressure depends upon a variant of the chronicle of Nikon. No other chronicle contains the information which would lead one to that conclusion. The accepted version of the chronicle of Nikon has Iakob Zakharievich leaving Moscow a little after May 3, possibly in response to a mission sent in April by Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky and Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiakin. On the other hand, the variant has Iakob Zakharievich leaving Moscow a little after March 3 before the mission to Mozhaisky and Shemiakin. The timing of Iakob Zakharievich's departure makes considerable difference in interpreting the motives of Mozhaisky and Shemiakin. According to the accepted text of the chronicle it would not be likely that his attack was the decisive factor which brought them to shift sides.
110. *PSRL*, VI, 45, VIII, 239, XII, 252; Cyprian, p. 162. The same reason was alleged in the cases of Princes Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiakin and Semion Ivanovich Bel'sky (*PSRL*, IV, 272, VI, 45, 240, VIII, 238-41, XII, 251-52; Cyprian, p. 162; *SRIO*, XXXV, 295, 299-300, 323, Z, I, #179). Religious pressure is not mentioned in the case of any other nobles deciding to desert Lithuania to join Moscow.
111. They were both great-great grandsons of Dmitri Donskoi.
112. *PSRL*, IV, 268, VIII, 225; Cyprian, p. 134.
113. *RK*, p. 23.
114. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
115. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
116. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
117. *Ibid.*, p. 24; *PSRL*, VI, 44, 243, VIII, 237. The fact that holders of these posts were princes who, aside from Feodor Ivanovich Bel'sky, were of lesser noble families, may have convinced not only Semion Ivanovich Mozhaisky but also Dmitri Ivanovich Bel'sky and Vasilii Ivanovich Shemiakin to desert Lithuania.
118. *PSRL*, IV, 281, VI, 24, 53, 247, XIII, pt. 1, 8, XVII, 345; *KKL*, p. 74; *RK*, pp. 39-39; *U*, p. 103; Z, II #33, #36, 1508.
119. Z, II, #57, 1509. This document also states that Mikhail L'vovich brought Prince Bogdan Feodorovich Glinsky, *namestnik* of Putivl' and Pan Mikolai Iur'evich Glebovich. Glebovich does not seem to have come voluntarily; repeated requests for his release finally succeeded in 1511 (*SRIO*, XXXV, 494, #84, pt. 25). Prince Bogdan Feodorovich also does not seem to have come voluntarily; there were repeated requests for his return and he appears to have died in a Muscovite prison (Z, II, #76, 1512?).
120. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 255. Cyprian, p. 177 asserts that Glinsky came to Moscow with his two brothers and "*many* [*italics mine*] of the King's nobles." Perhaps, then, additional nobles came to Moscow whose names do not appear in available documents.
121. See Appendix II.
122. See Appendix II.
123. Z, II, #33 (June, 1508).
124. Z, II, #33, #36, #41; *PSRL*, XVII, 343.
125. *LM*, V, #32.
126. *LM*, V, #179.
127. *ALM*, II, #511.
128. *ALM*, I, #235.
129. Z, I, #206 (1503); Z, II, #6 (1506-1507).

APPENDIX I: CARTOGRAPHIC METHODOLOGY

Map I was not drawn to explain developments in the period 1377-1430, for that period witnessed the rapid expansion of the frontiers of the Lithuanian-Russian state and did not see the loss of territory as a result of desertion by boyars. Consequently to have expanded the coverage of Map 1 to include the period 1377-1430 would have resulted in crowding the map with information not germane to the subject of this study. The reader may wish to refer to Map I to locate areas mentioned in the text in connection with developments in the period 1377-1430. Fortunately, all of the areas so mentioned, even if not then parts of the Lithuanian-Russian state, appear with the same or similar names in the period 1430-1514. The data compiled for the drawing of these maps were derived from the following sources (1) S. Semionov, *Geograficheskii Slovar' Rossiiskoi Imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1868-74), (2) *Spiski Naselionnikh Mest Rossiiskoi Imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1861-85), (3) USAAF Maps, scales: 1:1,000,000, 1:500,000, (4) German General Staff Maps (Berlin 1927-42), scales: 1:1,000,000, 1:300,000, 1:100,000 (many of these photolith copies of captured Russian maps), (5) Imperial Russian General Staff Maps (St. Petersburg, 1909-1915), scale: 1:300,000, (6) Polish General Staff Maps (Warsaw, 1934-36, scale: 1:50,000, (7) Mapa Litovsko-Russkogo Gosudarstva ot poloviny XV v. do Liublinskoi Unii 1569g. in M.K. Liubavsky, "Oblastnoe delenie i mestnoe upravlenie Litovsko-Russkogo Gosudarstva," *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh*, 167, scale: 1:2,50,000, (8) Mapa ziem Czernihow-Sewierskich in S. M. Kuczyński, *Ziemia Czernihow-Sewierskie nad Rzekami Litewskim*, scale: 1:2000,000, and (9) map in B. Spuler, "Mittelalterliche Grenzen in Osteuropa I. Die Grenze des Grossfürstentums Litauen in Südosten gegen Türken und Tataren," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, VI, 152-170. Semionov's work and the German 1:300,000 maps were the most useful sources. In the compilation of data, one important assumption was made, namely, that if a village, for example, mentioned in fifteenth century documents, could be definitely located for the nineteenth or twentieth century, it had the same location in the fifteenth century. Such an assumption may not be correct. Semionov has pointed out a few examples of villages and towns which shifted their sites. There may have been other shifts about which there is no available information. Fully 30 per cent of the towns and villages mentioned in documents could not be located in the above mentioned sources. Fortunately, with rare exceptions, it was possible to locate those mentioned in the text of this study. Except for important towns beyond the boundaries of the Lithuanian-Russian state which might help to orient the user of a map, only those villages and towns mentioned in the text or in Appendix II in the notes appear on the maps. All river systems within the Lithuanian-Russian state appear, as well as those lakes mentioned in the text. Hills and mountains appear only on Map II, to illustrate the importance of Muscovite control of the Dniepr watershed as a key to further expansion in the northeastern part of the Lithuanian-Russian state. Boundaries are based on Liubavsky's map, except (1) where later work indicates that Liubavsky was in error—in such cases others' boundaries have been used—and (2) where this author's work indicates that Liubavsky was in error. The latter occur only in the northeast and are dependent upon examination of treaties, 1492-1509, between Moscow and the Lithuanian-Russian state. Boundaries for this period have been drawn not so as barely to include those towns and villages definitely assigned to Lithuania but so as to include the major hill crests adjacent to those towns and villages, unless data from the treaties suggest that this procedure would be improper; consequently, the extent of Muscovite expansion in any given period between treaties has been conservatively estimated. Further explanation of three phases which are alongside symbols in the legends is in order: (1) "Exact location" means that the village or town in question has been found on maps mentioned above as sources 3-6 or that its location has been precisely described in sources 1-2, as, for example, two versts down the river from a known location; (2) "accurate within ten miles" means that the village or town in question has not been found on maps mentioned in sources 3-6 and that its location has been less precisely described in sources 1-2, as, for example, fifty versts southwest of a known location; (3) "approximate location" means either that the town or village in question has been found on maps mentioned as sources 7-8, but could not be found on maps mentioned as sources 3-6 and has not been located in sources 1-2, or that information from sources 1-2 and the sequence in which the town or village has been repeatedly mentioned in negotiations and treaties led the author to the conclusion that the town or village is located somewhere between two known locations and that, therefore, a guess is in order. I have only the highest regard for the work of Liubavsky, but his map is full of errors in the location of specific villages and towns; therefore, it has been impossible without substantiation to accept as accurate his location of villages and towns. Kuczynski's map is of a higher degree of accuracy. Unfortunately he did not use a symbol to indicate those locations which he may have

APPENDIX I: CARTOGRAPHIC METHODOLOGY

guessed; therefore his locations, also, require substantiation. Liubavsky has used symbols to indicate which towns were seats of agents of the government of the Lithuanian-Russian state. One might wonder why all those towns have not been located on Map I of this study. Towns not located probably became seats of governmental agents during the period 1514-69. That period is covered by Liubavsky's map but not by Map I of this study. I am in considerable disagreement with the boundary for 1494 on the map of Jan Natanson-Leski, "Dzieje granicy wschodniej Rzeczypospolitej," *Rozprawy historyczne*, I. He treats a large area as disputed. In fact only some of the towns and villages in that area were claimed by both Lithuania and Moscow. Disputed places which appear on Map 2 are Sil'kovichi, Novoe Selo, Uruga, Nemetzki, Bryn', Ust'e, Ren', Ornery Sukhinichi, Khoztza, Oleshnia, Zhabyn, and Bakino. Other places in that area were either not mentioned or were conceded either to Lithuania or Moscow. I have drawn the boundary so as to minimize the extent of Muscovite expansion, but in fact I have found a larger area conceded to Moscow than that drawn by Natanson-Leski. The source for my information is *SRIO*, XXXV, 118-37. Liubutsk remained under Lithuania probably at least until 1496.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

All officeholders appearing in the chart are listed below in alphabetical order with references substantiating their terms of office, their religion, and their native region. In the case of princely possessors the references refer to the periods of their control. Patronymics are treated as last names when they became established as such.

Achi-Girei, owner of Lida, 1439-45, Muslim (?).

Albert, pan of Kamenets, 1414, *RO*, II, 207, #1804, Catholic.

Aleksandrovich, Boris Semionovich, namestnik of Liubutsk and Mtsensk, 1492-93, *Z*, I, #105, 109, *PSRL*, XII, 233-34, XX, 210, taken prisoner and sent to Moscow 1493. *IA*, VII, 266, mentioned as namestnik of Mtsensk 1498 in complaint of Alexander to Ivan II but probably did not hold office then. *SRIO*, XXXV, 267, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1498, *LM*, V, #190, a post held by his father prior to 1486 (see below). The fact that father and son held a lesser post in Smolensk suggests they were natives of Smolensk and therefore Orthodox.

Aleksandrovich, Semion: okol'nichii of Smolensk before 1486, *LM*, #77. Orthodox. See Boris above.

Alekseev, Feodor, okol'nichii of Smolensk 1486, *LM*, IV, #77.

Andrei, mintsar of Vilna, 1510, *DZ*, #97, pt. 2.

Andrei Feod'kevich, pan, kliuchnik of Luts, 1456 or 1471-1486, *Z*, I, #59; *LM*, IV, #96.

Andrei Olgerdovich of Polotsk, prince, in possession of Trubchevsk in Chernigov-Seversk and of Polotsk on the death of his father in 1377. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 181, suggests Andrei lost control of Trubchevsk when he joined Moscow in 1379 or 1380. It is possible that Andrei lost control earlier, for his brother, Dmitri-Koribut, appears in chronicles, *PSRL*, VII, 255, VIII, 34, XI, 45, with the surname Trubchevsky in 1379-80. In the latter year he too joined Moscow. The chronicles specifically assert that he received Periaslavl but was unable to retain control of Trubchevsk. If *TL*, p. 418, may be trusted, Dmitri-Koribut took Trubchevsk into the Muscovite camp in 1379. He might well have tried to do that, but probably was either briefly successful or totally unsuccessful, for the above-cited references in *PSRL* reveal that Trubchevsk remained under Lithuanian control. At any rate Dmitri-Koribut regained control of Trubchevsk in 1382, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 175. Andrei retained control of Polotsk until 1386, when Skirgailo Olgerdovich seized it and put Andrei in jail, *U.*, p. 53. Andrei later escaped and fought with Pr. Sviatoslav Smolensky and Livonians against Lithuania, *PSRL*, XVII, 271, 322. Thereafter he entered Vitovt's service. He was killed in the Battle of the Vorskla, August 12, 1399, fighting against the Tatars, *PSRL*, VIII, 73; *NL*, p. 395; *TL*, p. 451. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 210, wrongly accuses Wolff of indulging in a fantasy in calling Prince Andrei Olgerdovich, prince of Lithuania and insists that Andrei nowhere appears with that title. Wolff is supported by *PSRL*, VIII, 60. This reference leaves open the question whether Andrei ever gathered support for a movement to make himself ruler of Lithuania and may have fled to Moscow because of the failure of such a movement. Orthodox.

Andrei Olekhnovich, pan, namestnik of Perelom and Ozha, 1493-94, *Z*, I, #113-14, *DZ*, #24, *LM*, V, #36, *ALM*, I, #112, and envoy to Moscow, 1493, *PSRL*, XII, 236, *IA*, VII, 267.

Avram, starosta of the city of Smolensk, 1508-09, *DZ*, #109-10, 114-15. At the same time he was in charge of toll collections, a responsibility he discharged through 1518 when he is first recorded as namestnik of Kovno, *Z*, II, #78, pt. 2. He was Jewish by birth, but joined the Catholic Church.

Bartosh Taborovich, pan, namestnik of Dubinich and Moishagol'e, 1495-1501, *ALM*, I, #199, 547, *LM*, V, #153, 202, *MHP*, XIV, #441, *Z*, I, #144, pt. 2, 165, 167, *DZ*, #74, brother of Albert (Voitekh), bishop of Vilna, Catholic.

Bernishchev, Sava, voskovnichii of Polotsk, 1507, *DZ*, #98.

Bogdan Koreevich, boiarin, namestnik of Molodechno, 1499, *LM*, V, #207, landholder in Minsk, *LM*, V, #262. Orthodox.

Bogdan Voidivilovich, namestnik of Vilna for the voevoda of Vilna, 1499, *LM*, V, #201.

Bogovitinovich, Bogush, pan, namestnik of Prelai, 1500-05, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #12, *LM*, V, #252, *ALM*, I, #710, namestnik of Zhizhmory, 1509, *SRIO*, XXXV, 448, namestnik of Dovkchi, 1509-14, *Z*, II, #61, *SRIO*, XXXV, 448, *IuZ*, I, #56, *DZ*, #125, 128, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #30, pt. 1, 36, pt. 1, *Z*, II, #79, *DZ*, #136, receiving Dovkchi for life, 1510, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #20. Descended from pan Bogovitin, an Orthodox supporter of Svidrigailo, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #3 (1430), #4 (1447), he was a member

- of a Volynian family, which was rising through marriage with Orthodox princely families, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), 296, Herberstein, *Commentaries*, II, 141.
- Bogovitinovich, Lev, kliuchnik of Brest, 1495-97, *LM*, V, #77, *DZ*, #52. See Bogush, above.
- Boreikov, Vasilii, namestnik of Smolensk, 1395, probably until 1401, *PSRL*, XVII, 46, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 168.
- Borov, Radivon, voskovnichii of Polotsk, 1507, *DZ*, #98.
- Briansky, Roman Mikhailovich, prince, ruler of Briansk, 1379-80, 1393-1401, went briefly to Moscow, 1375, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 153, 168, killed in Smolensk, August 1401, fighting the successful effort of Prince Iuri Sviatoslavovich to regain Smolensk from Lithuania, *PSRL*, VIII, 75, *TL*, p. 454. Orthodox.
- Butrim, Ian, voevoda of Smolensk, 1422, an official of Vitovt, 1401-30, *MHP*, VI, #234, *AluZ*, IV (Book 4), #1-2; VIII (Book 4), #1; *DZ*, #2, 7, Catholic.
- Butrim, Martin Iakubovich, pan, namestnik of Vilna, 1502, *IuZ*, I, #37, descendant of supporter of Vitovt and marshal, Butrim, 1407-30, *DZ*, #2, 7, who joined in the pledge of the nobility of 1413 to support the Horodlo Union, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21.
- Byk Aleksandrovich, namestnik of Vynitsa, c. 1492-94, *LM*, V, #27, cousin of Kmita.
- Chaletsky, Mikhail, pan, namestnik of Rechitsa, 1488-1511, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 48, 245.
- Czartoryski, Aleksandr Vasil'evich, prince, grandson of Prince Konstantin Olgerdovich, Orthodox landholder of Volynia, participated in the assassination of Great Prince Sigismund Keistutovich, 1440, *PSRL*, VIII, 107, XII, 30. He acted as a judge under Casimir, *IuZ*, I, #22, and controlled Chernigov, Logoisk, Kamenets, Ostashin, and Sporov, 1462-76. He may have succeeded to the half interest of his brother Ivan in the city of Trubchevsk, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 244. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 57, 91. Descendants joined the Catholic Church, c. 1610, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), XIX.
- Czartoryski, Feodor Mikhailovich, prince, grandson of Prince Konstantin Olgerdovich, starosta of Lutsk, 1449, *ALM*, I, #12.
- Czartoryski, Ivan Vasilievich, prince, grandson of Prince Konstantin Olgerdovich, a supporter of Svidrigailo, who, aroused by a rumor that Great Prince Sigismund Keistutovich planned to kill princes and pans at the approaching *seim*, discussed with Dovgird and Lelush means of thwarting Sigismund. He participated in the assassination of Sigismund, 1440, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 91, 94, 157, *PSRL*, VIII, 107, XII, 30. He later controlled half of Trubchevsk, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 244.
- Czartoryski, Semion Aleksandrovich, prince, son of above Aleksandr Vasil'evich, derzhavtsa of Kamenets, 1507, *Z*, II, #10.
- Danilovich, mytnik of Kiev, 1488, *SRIO*, XXXV, 11.
- Dmitri Aleksandrovich, pan, namestnik of Zhitomir, 1502-06, *ALM*, I, #627, *DZ*, #91, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #28, pt. 3, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 241.
- Dmitri Olgerdovich (the Elder), prince of Briansk, controlled Briansk until 1379 when he joined Moscow, *PSRL*, VIII, 36. He fought on the Muscovite side in the Battle of Kulikovo, *PSRL*, IV, 77, 81, VI, 96, VIII, 40, XI, 54, remained in Muscovite service at least until 1388, when he returned into Lithuanian service, possibly lured by the prospect of being given control of Pskov. Disappointed in that hope he returned to Muscovite service in 1389 and returned to Lithuania in time to die fighting for Vitovt in the Battle of the Vorskla, August 12, 1399, *PSRL*, VIII, 73, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 153-54, 160, 174-75, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 45.
- Dmitri Olgerdovich (the Younger) Koribut, prince of Trubchevsk, 1379 or 1380, 1382-92(?), see discussion under Andrei Olgerdovich of Polotsk. He may have been ruler of Briansk, 1380, 1382-92, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 175. Kuczynski argues, p. 154, that Hrushevsky was wrong in assuming that D. O. Briansky and D. O. Trubchevsky were the same person, because the chronicles would never have used the inferior title Trubchevsky in place of Briansky and because both Dmitris were mentioned in accounts of the Battle of Kulikovo of 1380. In so arguing, Kuczynski overlooks his own conclusion that Dmitri-Koribut succeeded Dmitri the Elder as prince of Briansk; therefore, Dmitri Koribut was both prince of Briansk and prince of Trubchevsky at the same time. When both Dmitris were fighting or serving on the same side during the period 1380-82, the Elder would be called Briansky and the Younger, Trubchevsky; however, whenever they were on opposite sides, they would both lay claim to the superior title, Briansky, whence the confusion.
- Domeborz, Andrei de, castellan of Kamenets under Poland, 1424, *MHP*, VI, #1165.
- Dorogobuzhsky, Andrei Dmitrievich, prince, local, Orthodox, selected as voevoda of Smolensk, by the people who had overthrown Pan Andrei Sakovich, 1440. He was shortly overthrown in favor of Pr. Iuri Semionovich Mstislavsky, *PSRL*, XVII, 68, 540, *AM*, XIV, 454-56.

- Dovgird (Dovgerd, Dolgerd, Dolgerth), signer of the Act of Union, 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, *ZPL*, 4, starosta of Podolia, 1430, when he was seized in Kamanets by Poles, *PSRL*, XVII, 529, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 58, voevoda of Vilna, in the 1430's through 1441, *MHP*, XII, 343, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 1, *ALM*, I, #5, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 94, *PSRL*, XVII, 533. He is recorded as dying with the title of voevoda, *PSRL*, XVII, 542 (1445), but *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 15, dated 1441, mentions Gasztold as voevoda. Since *PSRL*, XVII tends to be inaccurate, probably Dovgird died late 1440 or early 1441.
- Dovmont, Kontovtov, starosta of Samogitia, 1440-42, *PSRL*, XVII, 541.
- Dovoinovich, Andrei Iakubovich, pan, son of Iakub, descendant of Dovoino, signer of the Act of Union of 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, namestnik of Eishishki, 1508-11, *VK*, II, #2, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #30, *DZ*, #125.
- Dovoinovich, Andrushko, pan, namestnik of Gorodno, 1440-47(?), *ALM*, I, #7, Catholic.
- Dovoinovich, Iakub Ivanovich, pan, father of Andrei, namestnik of Drogichin, 1486-99, *LM*, IV, #99, 117, V, #5, 13, 88, 97, *ZPL*, p. 73, *MHP*, XIV, 440, 459. The editor of the last document has added an exclamation mark after the Latin word "drohinensi." I have uncovered no confirmation of the implication that there may be doubt as to whether Iakub was in office in 1499.
- Dovoinovich, Iuri Iakubovich, pan, namestnik of Bydogost, 1501, *ZPL*, p. 81, namestnik of Dovkchi, 1501-?, Liubavsky *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 148, *KD*, p. 617, Catholic.
- Dovoinovich, Ivan, pan, namestnik of Volkovysk, 1492-94, *Z*, I, #103, *LM*, V, #49, Catholic.
- Dovoinovich, Olekhno, pan, namestnik of Lida, 1435, *MHP*, XII, #232, namestnik of Brest, c. 1452, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 27, Catholic.
- Droshch, Andrei Aleksandrovich, pan, koniushii of Vilna 1500-04, and namestnik of Zblian, 1503, *LM*, V, #245, *DZ*, #78, *KD*, p. 695. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 255, confuses him with Pr. Andrei Aleksandrovich Sangushkovich and calls him *namestnik* of Kremenets.
- Drutsky, Ivan Semionovich, prince, namestnik of Polotsk, late 1420's, *MHP*, VI, #179, Orthodox.
- Drutsky, Vasilii Semionovich, prince, voevoda of Vilna under Svidrigailo probably from 1430 to December 8, 1432, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 67-68, 78, Orthodox.
- Dudka, Ofonos, kliuchnik of Gorodno, 1505, *DZ*, #85.
- Elena, princess, wife of Alexander of Lithuania, daughter of Ivan III, ruled Ezdno sometime between 1504-07, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 140-41, cf. Pan Mikhno Ivanovich and Pr. Matvei Nikitinich.
- Fedko Gavrilovich, gorodnichii of Gorodno, 1499, *MHP*, XIV, 460, #442.
- Feodor Grigor'evich (Tolstoi), namestnik of Stoklishki, 1495-99, *PSRL*, XVII, 553, *LM*, V, #219, pisar assisting peace missions to Moscow, 1494, 1500, *PSRL*, XII, 237-38, 251, *Z*, I, #179, pt. 1, 192, pt. 6, *SRIO*, XII, 313, 316, 325, 337.
- Feodor Ianushevich, pan, scribe, namestnik of Skerstomon, 1502-07, *IuZ*, I, #37, *DZ*, #81, *IuZ*, II, #80, 83, starosta of Vladimir, 1503-07, starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, 1506-07, *IuZ*, I, #37, *DZ*, #81, *PSRL*, XVII, 566, *Z*, II, #5, 25, *AluZ*, V, (Book 1), #5, pt. 3, *IuZ*, II, #80, 83-4. There is no reference to his holding the post of marshal of the Volynia land in 1506. It seems reasonable to interpolate that date, because no one else is listed as holding that post in 1506 and because from 1480-1514 all other starostas of Lutsk were simultaneously marshals of the Voynia land. He died either late in 1507 or early in 1508, *Z*, II, #32.
- Feodor Koriatovich, prince, grandson of Gedemin, with his brothers founded Braslavl', Sokolets, Kamenets, Smotrich, Skala, Chervlenoi, ruled Gomel until 1388, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 190-91, ruled Podolia almost independently of Lithuania until he joined the rebellion against Vitovt when the latter assumed the rule of Lithuania in 1392. Prince Feodor thereby lost Podolia in 1393, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 20, *Lith.*, pp. 444-46.
- Feodor Liubartovich, prince, grandson of Gedemin, ruled Lutsk until 1386 when he gave it to Prince Feodor Danilovich Ostrozhsy, and Vladimir and the rest of the Volynia land until 1393 when he lost them to Vitovt, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 21, receiving in their stead Novgorod-Seversk. He was apparently dissatisfied with his lot for in 1398 he was in Hungary with Svidrigailo. In 1430 on Vitovt's death, Jagailo tried unsuccessfully to gain control of Volynia for Feodor.
- Feodor Olizarovich, pan, namestnik of Kamenets, 1454, *ALM*, I, #16.
- Gabar', Olekhno, namestnik of Eishishki, 1488, *DZ*, #14.
- Gasztold, capitaneus of Vilna, 1389-91(?), *KD*, pp. 19, 37, of Krevo, 1401, *MHP*, VI, #233,

- signer of the Act of Union of 1401. *ZPL*, p. 4, *MHP*, VI, #234, negotiator with the Teutonic Order, 1398, *MHP*, VI, #179, and 1404, #295-97, *RO*, II, #1506, 1519-21, father of Ian. Gasztold may have continued in his post at Krevo for a few years as a leader of resistance against the Teutonic Order which was in control of Samogitia.
- Gasztold, Ian, namestnik of Dersunishki, 1422, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 55, starosta of Luts'k, 1434-35(?), namestnik of Smolensk, *c.* 1439, *ibid.*, p. 83, voevoda of Troki, 1440, *KD*, p. 189, voevoda of Vilna, 1441-57, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 15, pt. 23, *Z*, I, #54, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 4, *IuZ*, I, #28, 29, *ALM*, I, #14, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 122, *Z*, I, #57, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 11. *PSRL*, XVII, 542, says Gasztold succeeded Dovgird as voevoda of Vilna in 1445. Because *PSRL*, XVII is not generally reliable, 1441, appearing *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 15, is probably the correct date. Ian Gasztold signed the pledge of the nobility to support the Horodlo Union of 1413, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, *AUPL*, pp. 57, 69, and apparently started his career as Vitovt's envoy to the Teutonic Order, 1430, *MHP*, VI, #1418. He supported Sigismund Keistutovich and favored a pro-Polish policy, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 83, 95, 111, 115-16. Liubavsky fails to distinguish between Ian and his father. I believe them to be two persons because Ian is specifically called Ivashko Gashtoltovich, 1430, 1435, *MHP*, XII, #180, 232, because fifty-nine years (1398-1457) would represent an extraordinarily long period of public life, because there is an unexplained gap, 1404-22, within which no Gasztold appears in any official capacity, and because the Act of Union of 1401 was supported by Gasztold and the Horodlo Union of 1413 by one called Johannes Gasztold. Probably Ian Gasztold was too young to hold office during the period 1404-20, but as the son of a deceased but previously powerful Lithuanian nobleman enjoyed the right of giving at least *pro forma* support to the Horodlo Union of 1413.
- Gasztold, Martin Ianovich, pan, namestnik of Novgorod, 1457(?) to 1471, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 20, *PSRL*, XVII, 549 lists him as namestnik of Novgorod in 1447. See Pan Olekhno Sudimontovich. That is impossible because Pan Piotr Monygirdovich was namestnik until at least 1452, possibly until 1455. Martin was appointed voevoda of Kiev 1471 because of opposition to Casimir's desire to appoint the son of the late prince of Kiev. He was rejected by the Kievans, *PSRL*, II, 358. They accepted him as namestnik no earlier than the middle of 1473, for he appears without titles early in 1473, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 20. He enjoyed that post until 1480, *AluZ*, IV (Book I), 8, Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 228, and no later than early 1482. In that year he appears as voevoda of Troki, *LM*, IV, #63, 74.
- Gasztold, Olbrakht Martinovich, pan, namestnik of Novgorod, 1503-05, 1508-09, *LM*, V, 254, *Z*, I, 213, *IuZ*, I, #39, starosta of Bel'sk, 1513-14, and voevoda of Polotsk, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #38, 41, *DZ*, #136, 140.
- Gedigold, Minigailo, starosta of Oshmiany, 1387-98, *Z*, I, #9, *RO*, II, #1394, voevoda of Vilna, 1407, *AluZ*, IV (Book I), #1, VIII (Book 4), #1, *DZ*, #2, voevoda of Kiev, prior to 1411, *MHP*, XII, #35, *RO*, II, #1683, pan of Vilna, 1413-15, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, *AUPL*, pp. 57, 69, Liubavsky, *Litovski-russkii seim* p. 50. Liubavsky suggests that he may have been pan of Vilna until 1419. That seems unlikely, for he was starosta of Podolia in 1415, *MHP*, VI, #651; he could hardly have served in both posts in view of the great distance between Vilna and Podolia. He was starosta of Podolia until 1422, *AluZ*, IV (Book 4), #2, Ghillebert de Lannoy, *Oeuvres*, pp. 58-59, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 54. Then again voevoda of Kiev, and namestnik of Smolensk, 1424-25, *ibid.*, p. 50, voevoda of Vilna, 1425-30, *ibid.*, p. 50, *MHP*, VI, #1362, 1418, XII, #180. In 1430 he received the now empty honor of starosta of Podolia, empty because Poles overran Podolia, *DZ*, #7. A supporter of Sigismund, he re-emerged as voevoda of Vilna in 1431. He probably did not enjoy that post until 1432 and continued therein until about 1435, *PSRL*, XVII, 530, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 66-67, 78. He supported the Act of Union of 1401 and the Horodlo Union of 1413. O. Halecki has proven that Minigailo and Gedigold were one and the same person, "Przyczyniki genealogiczne do dziejow ukł'adu krewskiego," *Miesięcznik Heraldyczny* (1935), #7-8, p. 111.
- Gedigold, Sen'ko, namestnik of Smolensk, 1450-51, pan of Vilna, 1451, *KD*, pp. 229-30, *Z*, I, #54, pt. 1, son of above, Catholic.
- Geresh, Erin, mytnik of Luts'k, 1501-03, *DZ*, #76, 79, native of Cracow, Catholic.
- Ginvil, koniushii of Vilna, 1434, *KD*, p. 150.
- Ginvil, Kimunt, voevoda (?) of Troki, 1384(?) - 88(?), under Skirgailo, *RO*, II, 131, 139.
- Glazinich, Olekhno Vasil'evich, prince, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1486-99, namestnik of Luchin, 1495-99, *LM*, III, #4, IV, #77, 92, V, #93-220. A local landholder, probably Orthodox.
- Glebovich, Iuri, pan, namestnik of Smolensk, 1492-99, *Z*, I, #108, 118, 148, 160, 172, *DZ*, #31, 46, 55, 62, 63, *LM*, III, #4, 9, 26, 28-30, 33, V, 34, 10, 17, 27, 30, 39, 54-6, 66-7,

- 93, 98, 114, 118, 120, 130, 145, 184, 186, 189-90, 198, 224, *ALM*, I, #115, 118, 186, 265, erroneously labeled starosta and pan of Samogitia, 1494-95, *ALM*, I, #147, namestnik of Ros' and Obolitsy, 1500, *IuZ*, I, #236, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1503-08, *LM*, V, #259, Z, II, #40, and voevoda of Smolensk, 1511-14, Z, II, #66, *PSRL*, XIII (pt. 2), 13, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #41, *DZ*, #136, probably erroneously called namestnik, *PSRL*, XIII (pt. 2), 16. He was the brother of Stanislav and, although of Russian ancestry, a descendant of a boyar of Vitovt and therefore probably Catholic, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 157-58, 350.
- Glebovich, Piotr, pan, namestnik of Novgorod-Litovsk, 1502, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii-seim*, p. 334, ftn. 78.
- Glebovich, Stanislav, pan, namestnik of Merech, 1492-95, *ZPL*, p. 72, Z, I, #103, *LM*, V, #38-9, 42, 44-5, 48, 54-6, 59, *ALM*, I, #135, 157, without post July 17, 1495, *LM*, V, #97, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1495-1501, *ALM*, I, #260, 263-64, *LM*, III, #33, V, #101, 150, 175, 217, 224-25, *DZ*, #48, 69, Z, I, #172, *IuZ*, I, #36, namestnik of Polotsk, 1502-05, *LM*, V, #249-50, 252, 258-59, *PSRL*, XII, 257, Z, I, #209-10, *DZ*, #84, and voevoda of Polotsk, 1505-11, *DZ*, #92, #133, Z, I, #213, II, #10, 25, 42, 49-50, 64-71, 73, *IuZ*, I, #49, *PSRL*, XIII (pt. 1), 10 (pt. 2), 14, *SRIO*, XXXV, 493-94, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #34. Like his brother Iuri he was probably Catholic. He was marshal of Lithuania from 1494 throughout the rest of his public life. An envoy from Alexander to Ivan as early as 1493, *PSRL*, VIII, 225, he represented Lithuania in peace negotiations in 1500, Z, I, #179, pt. 1, in 1503, *PSRL*, XII, 257, and in 1509-11, *PSRL*, XIII (pt. 1), 10 (pt. 2), 14, *SRIO*, XXXV, 486, 493-94.
- Glinsky, Bogdan Feodorovich, prince, namestnik of Putivl', 1495-1500, Z, I, #130, #151, *ALM*, I, #195, 201, 259, *DZ*, #39, Z, I, #154, 158, *DZ*, #60, *SRIO*, XLI, 328, Z, I, #178. He fell into Muscovite hands when Putivl' was captured in 1500, *PSRL*, VI, 46, 243, VIII, 239, XII, 252, XVII, 561. He was probably released at the end of hostilities in 1503, for there was a complaint against a judicial decision rendered by him in 1507, *DZ*, #99. In 1509 he is recorded as having entered Muscovite service with Prince Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky, Z, II, #57. He probably did not take that step of his own free will, for there are complaints over his imprisonment, 1510-12, *SRIO*, XXXV, #84, pt. 33, #85, pts. 79-20, and there is evidence that he died in a Muscovite prison, probably in 1512, Z, II, #76. He was the beneficiary of grants in 1498 and 1499, Z, I, #154, 178, and was a leader in the Lithuanian armies which fought against Moscow in 1500, *SRIO*, XLI, 328, 345. His branch of the Glinsky family apparently remained Orthodox, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 90, for he endowed the Orthodox Nikolai-Pustynsky monastery of Kiev, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 87. After his capture he was mentioned as Bogdan Feodorovich Putivl'sky, Z, II, #78. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 251, conjectures intelligently that Alexander of Lithuania may have given him this title in recognition of his resistance to Moscow.
- Glinsky, Grigorii Borisovich, prince, namestnik of Ovruch', 1496 to 1502 or 1503, and of Drutsk, 1502-03, *DZ*, #42, Z, I, #140, *PSRL*, XVII, 564-65, killed 1502 or 1503, fighting against the Tatars near Ovruch'. His father, Prince Boris Glinsky witnessed the Peace of September 4, 1437, between Lithuania and Poland, by which Sigismund Keistutovich promised that Lithuania and Kiev, the native land of the Glinskys, would be given to Poland on his death, *MHP*, II (pt. 1), #92. Immediately thereafter Prince Boris joined Svidrigailo and appeared as his supporter and as a minor official, 1437-46, *IuZ*, I, #19, 21, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 153. Consequently Grigorii probably Orthodox.
- Glinsky, Ivan Borisovich, prince, namestnik of Chernigov, 1492-96, *SRIO*, XLI, 166, Z, I, #102, 133, *ALM*, I, #235, brother of above, Orthodox.
- Glinsky, Ivan L'vovich, prince, namestnik of Ozha and Perelom, 1495-1504, *LM*, V, #86, Z, I, #207, *DZ*, #78, 83, voevoda of Kiev, 1505-07, Z, II, #1, *DZ*, #95, *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, voevoda of Novgorod, 1507, until his desertion, Z, II, #7. The last reference to him as voevoda of Kiev is for July 1507. Apparently he continued in that post in spite of the fact that Sigismund had transferred him to the post of Novgorod in January 1507. Inasmuch as he deserted to Moscow with his brother Mikhail in 1508, Z, II, #34, pt. 1, #37, it is possible that he never actually exercised control over Novgorod. Perhaps he was displeased at what was a reduction in rank and because of his displeasure was more easily induced to desert to Moscow. Although his brother, Mikhail, was Catholic, there is no evidence that Ivan followed his brother from Orthodoxy to Catholicism. In the absence of such evidence, his religious position must be labeled "unknown."
- Glinsky, Mikhail L'vovich, prince, namestnik of Utsiana, 1498-1506, namestnik of Merech, 1501-05, and namestnik of Bel'sk, 1505-06, *LM*, V, #207, 228, 234, 237, 240, 244-45, Z, I, #185, 192, 194-5, *DZ*, #71, 74-5, *IuZ*, I, #37-8, *LM*, V, #247, 252-53, 258-59, *DZ*,

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- #80-1, Z, I, #201, 205, 207, *DZ*, #83, 85, 89, 91, 92, *IuZ*, I, #41, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, pt. 1, Z, I, #213, 218-20, 222, 224, *DZ*, #94-96, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 81. He was Catholic, Herberstein, *Notes*, II, 92. He deserted Lithuania for Moscow in 1508, after having assassinated his political competitor, Pan Ian Iur'evich Zaberezinsky, Z, II, #33, 36, 41, *PSRL*, VI, 53, 247, XIII (pt. 1), 8, XVII, 289, 345, *IA*, VII, 276.
- Glinsky, Vasilii Danilovich, prince, starosta of Cherkassy, 1507, *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, #6, Orthodox.
- Glinsky, Vasilii L'vovich, prince, namestnik of Vasilishki, 1501-05, *LM*, I, #73, V, #259, *DZ*, #83, Z, I, #218, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, pp. 85-6, brother of Mikhail with whom he fled to Moscow. Religion unknown.
- Goitsevich, Ivashko, pan, namestnik of Brest, 1452, *ALM*, I, #68.
- Gol'shansky, Aleksandr Iur'evich, prince, namestnik of Gorodno, 1486-1503, pan of Vilna, 1492-1507, possibly to 1509, starosta of Brest, 1507-10, *LM*, IV, #4, 10, V, #27, *ZPL*, p. 72, Z, I, #103, 126, *ALM*, I, #137, 147, 160, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, *LM*, V, #123-25, 133, 135, 147, 155, 158-59, 166, 180, 188, 209-12, 218, 219, 224, *IuZ*, #22, 73, *MHP*, XIV, 459, Z, I, #163, 170, 172, 182, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #22, *LM*, V, 235, *ZPL*, p. 78, *IuZ*, #36, *DZ*, #75, *LM*, V, #247, Z, I, #198, 202-03, 206, II, #4, 8, 25, 29, pt. 1, 30, *SPS*, #7, *IuZ*, #56, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #19. The last citation speaks of the recently deceased Prince Aleksandr Iur'evich. Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 102, refers to him as pan of Vilna in 1509, but I have been unable to uncover any substantiation of that date. He was the son of Iuri Semionovich, grandson of Semion Ivanovich, and great-grandson of Ivan Olgimuntovich. Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 102, labels him Orthodox, and Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 226, indicates that he was one of three Russians who held office in Vilna and Troki. Prince Ivan Olgimuntovich Gol'shansky and his sons, Andrei and Semion, signed the Act of Union of 1401, *ZPL*, p. 3, *MHP*, VI, #234, a fact which might indicate that they were Catholic. Ivan Olgimuntovich was an adviser to Vitovt, *RO*, II, #1198-99, *MHP*, VI, #63, 179, and pledged his loyalty to Jagailo in the event of Vitovt's death, Z, I, #18, *MHP*, II, #27. Semion attacked Svidrigailo, under the leadership of Sigismund Keistutovich, in 1432, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 72. His son, Iuri, helped to elect Casimir, as Great Prince of Lithuania, in 1440, but by 1453 was a leader of a group in the seim of that year, which opposed Casimir and the Poles and favored a pro-Prussian policy, *ibid.*, pp. 95, 122. He contributed to the Orthodox Pechersky monastery in Kiev, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 99. Ivan Iur'evich, brother of Aleksandr, was one of those who plotted the assassination of Casimir in 1481. *Ibid.*, pp. 124-25, Papee, *Polska i Litwa*, I, 69-70, *PSRL*, VI, 35. On balance, then, it seems likely, but not certain that the Gol'shanskys were Orthodox, at least in the third and fourth generations.
- Gol'shansky, Ianush, prince, namestnik of Slonim, 1503, *KD*, p. 665.
- Gol'shansky, Iuri Aleksandrovich, prince, son of above, namestnik of Belitsa, 1505-07, voevoda of Kiev, 1508-10, Z, I, #219, *DZ*, #100, *CDV*, VII, #51, Z, II, #44, *AluZ*, VI (Book 1), #9. His mother was Sofia Sudimuntovicha (see Olekhno) and his brother, Pavel, Catholic bishop of Vilna, Papee, *Polska i Litwa*, I, 69; therefore, he was probably Catholic.
- Gol'shansky, Ivan Olgimuntovich, prince, voevoda of Kiev, after the expulsion of local princes in 1397, *PSRL*, II, 352. See Prince Aleksandr Iur'evich Gol'shansky. Catholic(?).
- Gol'shansky, Mikhail Ivanovich, prince, son of Ivan Olgimuntovich, nominal voevoda of Kiev, sometime in the twenties of the fifteenth century, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 50. Catholic(?).
- Gol'shansky, Semion Iur'evich, prince, starosta of Lutsk, 1493-99, marshal of the Volynia land, 1494-99, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 2, *LM*, V, #33-4, #95, Z, #124, *LM*, V, #135-36, 147, Z, I, #145, pt. 2, *LM*, V, #164, 166, 168, *DZ*, #56, voevoda of Novgorod, 1500-01, *LM*, V, #243, *DZ*, #71, namestnik of Kamenets, 1501-04, and to his death in 1504-05, *DZ*, #71, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #5, pt. 2, Z, I, #201, 212, *PSRL*, XVII, 566. Orthodox, brother of Aleksandr Iur'evich.
- Gostsky, Bogdan Sen'kovich, pan, kliuchnik of Lutsk, 1492-99, *LM*, V, #2, 33, 95, *DZ*, #70, member of an important landholding family in Volynia, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 153, probably Orthodox.
- Grinko Volovich, pan, koniushii of Prince Ivan Vasil'evich Czartoryski, in control of Trubchevsk as koniushii, 1455-60, may have become namestnik, 1460, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 247-49.
- Gromyko, Grigorii Isaevich, kliuchnik of Vilna, 1509-12, derzhavtsa of Svisloch, 1510-12, Z, II, #57, 78, pt. 1, *SRIO*, XXXV, 490, 494, *DZ*, #97, pt. 2.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Grytsko Konstantinovich, prince, grandson of Olgerd, may have controlled Chernigov for a short time from 1388, 1389 or 1390 under Skirgailo, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 171-72.
- Goshenits, Ian, pan, voevoda of Novgorod, 1435, *MHP*, XII, #232, Catholic.
- Hanco (Hanulo, Hannike), burgher, capitaneus of Vilna, 1382-85, *RO*, II, #1090-92, *MHP* (Part 1), 4, supporter of the Krevo Union, Catholic.
- Iakub Ivashentsovich, namestnik of Mozyr, 1506-07, went to Moscow with Pr. Mikhail Glinsky, 1508, *Z*, II, #206, *SRIO*, XXXV, 491, #85, pt. 20, Catholic(?).
- Iakub Kezmarkovich, lentvoit of Polotsk, 1505, *DZ*, #90. His non-Russian name indicates that he was probably Catholic.
- Iamunt Tuluikovich, prince, namestnik of Smolensk after seizure of that city, September 28, 1395, *PSRL*, XVII, 46, may have held that post until he undertook negotiations with Moscow and the Teutonic Order, 1398, *MHP*, VI, 54, *PSRL*, VIII, 71, killed in the Battle of the Vorskla, August 12, 1399, *PSRL*, VIII, 73, XVII, 47, Catholic.
- Ian, namestnik of Chernigov, 1488, *SRIO*, XXXV, 11.
- Ian (Joannes), palatinus of Drogichin, 1388, *KD*, p. 28.
- Ian, pan, namestnik of half of Trubchevsk, 1477, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 244.
- Ian Piotrovich, pan, namestnik of Markov, 1498-99, *DZ*, #59, *MHP*, XIV, 459, namestnik of Punia, 1500, *KD*, p. 553, sent to Smolensk, he was killed fighting Moscow, 1500, *PSRL*, XVII, 559-60. *DZ*, #59, lists him as namestnik of Merech, but that is probably a mistaken substitution for Markov, for Pan Grigorii Stanislavovich Ostikovich was namestnik of Merech at that time.
- Ian Stetskovich, pan, namestnik of Drogichin, 1501-09, *ZPL*, p. 81, *DZ*, #83, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #14, *Z*, II, #61, *IuZ*, I, #56. In the last two references he is called the former starosta of Drogichin. Since those references are dated 1509 and 1510, he clearly did not hold the post later than early 1509.
- Iavnis, voevoda of Troki, 1412-32, *SHRM*, #216-17, *MHP*, VI, #1418, XII, #180, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 59, 66, *KD*, pp. 90, 99, 136, 138, 144, 741, Catholic.
- Ilinich, Il'ia Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Minsk, 1497, *LM*, III, #34, Catholic.
- Il'inich Iuri Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Lida, 1501-14, starosta of Brest, 1410-14, *ZPL*, p. 81, *DZ*, #74, *LM*, V, #247, *AluZ*, I, #4, pt. 1, *Z*, II, #29, pt. 3, 50, 66, 71, 73, Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, #19, *DZ*, #130, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 336, Catholic.
- Il'inich, Ivan, pan, father of Il'ia, Iuri, and Mikolai, namestnik of Volkovysk, 1473, *LM*, II, #1, pt. 4, namestnik of Drogichin, 1476, *KD*, p. 350, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1483-86, *KD*, p. 412, *Z*, I, #80, 81, namestnik of Smolensk, 1487-89, *LM*, IV, #100, 106, *SRIO*, XXXV, #7, descended from a boiarin of Mogilev, Il'ia, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 350, Orthodox. Married Catholic, *KD*, p. 412.
- Il'inich, Mikolai Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Minsk, 1494-95, *ALM*, I, #114, 179, namestnik of Smolensk, 1499; *LM*, V, #219-20, Catholic.
- Iundilovich, Mikolai, pan, namestnik of Dubichi, 1499-1514, and Koneva, 1500-14, *ZPL*, p. 73, *LM*, V, #239, 259, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 337.
- Iuri Ivanovich, (Iursha), pan, namestnik of Briansk, starosta of Lutsk, voevoda of Kiev, successively, in the period 1430-38, under Svidrigailo, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 177-78, identified in control of Kiev, 1435-37, *ibid.*, p. 227, *IuZ*, I, #19, *MHP*, II (pt. 1), 86, possibly Orthodox.
- Iursha, Ivashko, pan, namestnik of Vladimir, 1488-89, *Z*, I, #92, *LM*, IV, #109, V, #11, probably a descendant of the above Pan Iuri Ivanovich, possibly Orthodox.
- Ivan, namestnik of Brest, 1406, *MHP*, VI, #339, p. 125.
- Ivan Andreevich, pan, namestnik of Utsiana, 1508, *VK*, II, #2, namestnik of Moishagol'e and Dubinich, 1508, *IuZ*, I, #46, namestnik of Velenia, 1501-14, *IuZ*, I, #56, *DZ*, #125, *Z*, II, #78, pt. 2.
- Ivan Dashkovich, prince, namestnik of Cherkassy, 1500, *SRIO*, XLI, 330, may have been a member of the Glinsky family. The Glinsky family had holdings in the vicinity of Cherkassy, *Z*, I, #129 (1499) and a Prince Ivan Dashkovich Glinsky received lands in adjacent Kiev, 1499, *Z*, I, #171, *LM*, V, #214. If this identification is correct, Ivan Dashkovich may well have been Orthodox, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 70.
- Ivan Ivanovich, prince, okol'nichii of Smolensk, probably in 1506, *DZ*, #107.
- Ivan Vasil'evich, prince, namestnik of Minsk, 1489, *LM*, IV, #16.
- Ivan Vladimirovich, prince, received Liubutsk from his father, 1410, *SGGD*, I, #40.
- Ivashko Iatskovich, namestnik of Smolensk, 1469, *KD*, p. 305.
- Ivashko Ivashevich, namestnik of Braslavl'(?), 1452, *KD*, p. 236, pan of Vilna, 1460, Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 226 and Kozel'sk, Orthodox.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Keistut Gedeminovich, prince, brother of Olgerd, father of Vitovt and Sigismund, controlled Troki, Novgorod, and other cities until 1382; he at first accepted his nephew, Jagailo, as Great Prince of Lithuania, 1377, but sought to seize power and was assassinated in 1382.
- Kevla, Bogdan, namestnik of Vilna of the voevoda of Vilna, 1495, *LM*, V, #83.
- Kezgailo Volimuntovich, brother of Gudigird, Kunibold, Shedibor, and Sudovoi, father of Ian and Mikhail, hauptmann of Vilkomir, 1410, *MHP*, VI, 208, *RO*, II, #1664, he may have been given this post as early as 1409 so that he might develop a strong point in the offensive line against the Teutonic Order which at that date was still in control of Samogitia. In 1418 he was mentioned as the hauptmann who took prisoners in the district of Mednik, a town in Samogitia, *MHP*, VI, 409. He may have controlled that part of Samogitia which Lithuania reconquered, first from Vilkomir and later from Mednik. He was starosta of Samogitia, 1422-48, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 54, *MHP*, VI, 669-709, 715, 921, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 66, 95, *SHRM*, #217, *PSRL*, XVII, 535-36, *IuZ*, I, #27. In the last citation he appears as pan of Vilna, 1448. His actual control of Samogitia was interrupted by a revolt which put Prince Mikhail Sigismundovich in control, 1440-42. A signer of the Act of Union of 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, *ZPL*, p. 4, he was doubtless Catholic.
- Kezgailovich, Ian, pan, starosta of Samogitia, 1449 to 1484, pan of Vilna, 1481-90, *KD*, p. 217, *LM*, III, #1, pts. 13, 19, 20, *MHP*, XIV, 173, 213, *LM*, IV, #63, 74, 84, 86, *Z*, I, #77-78, 80, 85, *ALM*, I, #40, Catholic, father of Stanislav.
- Kezgailovich, Mikhail, pan, namestnik of Smolensk, 1451-55, *MHP*, XIV, 56, *Z*, I, #57, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 11, voevoda of Vilna, 1460-77, *Z*, I, #64, *LM*, III, #1, pts. 2-4, 6-8, 10, 12, 14, 20, *MHP*, XIV, 172, 212-13, *KD*, pp. 348-51, 355, 359, chancellor of Lithuania from 1450, *Z*, I, #54, pt. 1, Catholic, favored a pro-Polish policy in the seim of 1453, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 121.
- Kezgailovich, Stanislav Ianovich, pan, starosta of Samogitia, 1486-1514, pan of Troki, 1499-1514, *LM*, IV, #97, *MHP*, II, 298, *ZPL*, p. 72, *Z*, I, #103, 114, *LM*, III, #15-16, *Z*, I, #120, *LM*, V, #8-10, 35, 70, 96, *DZ*, #30, *LM*, III, #126, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, *Z*, I, #100, 163, 170-72, *MHP*, XIV, 459, *ZPL*, p. 73, *Z*, I, #176, *LM*, V, #187-88, 209-12, 214, 217, 219, 224, 235, 238, *Z*, I, 179 pt. 1, 182, 191, 192, pts. 3, 6-9, *DZ*, #77, *Z*, I, #198, *LM*, #77, *Z*, I, #198, *LM*, V, #247, 257-61, 264, *Z*, I, #206, 213, *DZ*, #87, *Z*, II, #8, 25, 29-31, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #5, pt. 3, *Z*, II, #40, *DZ*, #117, *Z*, II, #50, 53, 60, 63-65, 67-68, 70-71, 73, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #34, *DZ*, #133, *Z*, II, #80, 82, 84, *DZ*, #136-37, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #41, Catholic.
- Khodkovich, Aleksandr Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Punia, voevodich of Troki, 1502, *IuZ*, I, #37, Orthodox, granted land to Orthodox Blagoveshchansky monastery, 1509, *IuZ*, I, #53.
- Khodkovich, Iuri, pan, voevoda of Kiev, 1510, *SRIO*, XCV, 88, Orthodox.
- Khodkovich, Ivan, pan, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1452(?) -76, *PSRL*, XVII, 548 (see Pan Olekhno Sudimontovich for problem of dating this reference). Starosta of Lutsk, perhaps during the period from after 1457 to 1471, namestnik of Lida, 1471, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 4, voevoda of Kiev, 1482, *PSRL*, VI, 234-35, VIII, 215, XVII, 341. He was mentioned as previous ruler of Lutsk, *Z*, I, #153 (1498). The close succession of starosty and namestniki of Lutsk makes it evident that he could not possibly have held the post of starosta after 1480. It seems likely that he held the post in the more vigorous period of his life before 1471, at which time he became marshal of Lithuania. His father, Pan Khodko Iur'evich, was a supporter of Svidrigailo, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 78-79, and a Kievan, *ibid.*, p. 356, Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 228, and his son, Aleksandr granted land to the Orthodox Church; thus he was probably Orthodox.
- Khodkovich, Pavel, pan, namestnik of Kamenets, 1476, Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, IX, 57. See Ivan above, Orthodox.
- Knolonevsky, Gavriilo, del'chii of Lutsk, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #42, pt. 1, probably Orthodox, for the last Kholonevsky mentioned as Orthodox appeared 1619, and the first as Catholic appeared 1635, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxv.
- Khrebtovich, Feodko Bogdanovich, pan, namestnik of Belitsa, 1501, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #27, namestnik of Ostryń, sometime before the year 1510, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 158, descended from a boiarin of Svidrigailo, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii-siem*, p. 350, whose name Khrebet or Threbet suggests that he may not have been of Russian descent. Possibly Catholic.
- Khrebtovich, Ian Litavor Bogdanovich, pan, namestnik of Utsiana, 1489, *LM*, IV, #117, namestnik of Slonim, 1492-1500, namestnik of Novgorod, 1499-1500, *LM*, III, #3, 14, V, 33, 57, 68, 88, 93, 111, 112, *Z*, I, #124, *ALM*, I, #199, 253, *LM*, V, #124, 163, 168, *DZ*, #67, 69, *PSRL*, XVII, 559. He was taken prisoner by Muscovite troops on Mitkov field near the Vedrosha River, July 14, 1500, *PSRL*, XII, 252. Although requests were made for

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- his release in 1501-03, Z, I, #192, pt. 9, he apparently was not released until 1509 when he is mentioned again for the first time as marshal of Lithuania, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #2, a post he had held, 1497-1500, *DZ*, #54, *SRIO*, XLI, 252, 318, 328, 345. He was again namestnik of Slonim, and namestnik of Drogichin, 1510, *IuZ*, I, #56-57, *DZ*, #125, Z, II, #61. Derzhavtsa of Kovno, 1510-14, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 171. Possibly Catholic.
- Khrebtovich, Martin Bogdanovich, pan, tivun of Zbliane, 1495, *LM*, V, #110, namestnik of Zholubok, c. 1500, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 158, possibly Catholic.
- Khrebtovich, Vasilii Bogdanovich, pan, namestnik of Gorukhovo and Zdolbitsa, 1495, namestnik of Vladimir, 1495-1501, *ALM*, I, #209, *LM*, V, #82, 215, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #21, *DZ*, #66, 71, received Gorukhovo "do voli," possibly Catholic.
- Khrshchan Neverovich, tivun of Vilna, 1494, *LM*, V, #46-47.
- Kirdeevich, Olisar Shilovich, pan, starosta of Vladimir, 1461-75, 1480-84, starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, 1480-86, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #25, pt. 10, *IuZ*, II, #76, 78, Z, I, #84, pts. 1-2, *LM*, IV, #88, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 1. In a footnote to the first reference Vladimirsky-Budanov asserts that Olizar held the post of starosta of Vladimir from 1461. I have been unable to substantiate that date. Because his father, Pan Gavril Shilo Kirdeevich, was from Volynia and a member of Svidrigailo's council from 1430-45, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #3, *IuZ*, I, #18, Z, I, #37, *IuZ*, I, #24, and because Olizar and his wife gave land to the Orthodox church, Z, I, #84, pts. 1-2, Olizar must be deemed Orthodox.
- Kisel, Tikhno, del'chii of Lutsk, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #42, pt. 1.
- Kishka, Stanislav Petrashkovich, pan, son of Pan Petrashko Pashkovich, namestnik of Lida, 1493-99, *LM*, III, #19, V, #25, 49, 68, 88, *ALM*, I, #157, Z, I, #137, *LM*, III, #30, V, #188, Z, I, #163, *ZPL*, p. 73, *MHP*, XIV, 459, namestnik of Smolensk, 1500-03, *PSRL*, XII, 251, Z, I, #179, pt. 1, 182, *IuZ*, I, #36, *LM*, V, #235-36, 258-60, namestnik of Vasilishki, 1506-07, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 156, namestnik of Gorodno, 1507-13, Z, II, #10, 25, 29, 31, 50, 53, 56, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #34, Z, II, #64-66, 69-71, 73, *DZ*, #130-31, 133, Z, II, #83, Catholic. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 336, relying on Wolff, indicates that Kishka was namestnik of Vasilishki, 1503-07, dates which are impossible. This does not conform with his earlier conclusion, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 156, and ignores the tenure of office of Prince Vasilii L'vovich Glin'sky which Liubavsky recognized.
- Klochko, Voitekh Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Utsiana, 1493-97, Z, I, #114, *ALM*, I, #184, *LM*, V, #157, namestnik of Kovno, 1497-1509, namestnik of Belsk, 1507-11, Z, I, #149, *LM*, V, #157, 200, 202, 205, Z, I, #165 (Kievsky appears in place of Kovensky, an error.), 166, 181, 185, *LM*, V, #226-33, 237, 239-40, 243-45, Z, I, #191, 199, *IuZ*, I, #37, *LM*, V, #249-50, 256-59, *SPS*, #4, Z, I, #200, 204, 207, 209, *PSRL*, XII, 257 (Kovensky is misspelled Kodensky.), *DZ*, #83, Z, I, #219, 223-24, Z, II, #29, pt. 1, *SPS*, #7, *IuZ*, I, #45, *DZ*, #109, Z, II, #50, *SRIO*, XXXV, 488, 494, marshal and okhmistr of the Great Princess Elena, he was entrusted with a mission to Moscow, 1494, *PSRL*, XII, 246-48, and was second in command of a similar mission, 1509-11, *SRIO*, XXXV, 488, 494.
- Kmita Aleksandrovich, pan, namestnik of Vynitsa, 1480's, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 261-62, namestnik of Putivl', 1486-90, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, *LM*, IV, #7, #8, namestnik of Cherkassy, 1494-95, *LM*, V, #31, Z, I, #130.
- Konstantin Olgerdovich, prince, ruled Chernigov to 1388-90, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 171-72.
- Kopot, Vasilevich, pan, namestnik of Zhizhmory, 1509-12, Z, II, #61, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #36, pt. 1.
- Koretsky, Ivan Vasilevich, prince, namestnik of Krasnosel'sk, 1492, *LM*, V, #2, descendant of Prince Aleksandr Patrikeevich Narimuntovich, important landholder of Volynia, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 57, 153. The first Koretsky to join the Catholic Church did so c. 1617, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxi. Orthodox.
- Koshka, Ivan Antonovich, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1482-98, *LM*, V, #155-56, *SRIO*, XXXV, 81, *DZ*, #55, a landholder in Smolensk, probably Orthodox.
- Kostevich, Ianush Stankovich, namestnik of Radun, 1499-1511, *IuZ*, I, #22, *LM*, V, #247, Z, II, #66, voevoda of Vitebsk, 1514, *DZ*, #136, probably Catholic.
- Koshka, Ivan Antonovich, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1482-98, *LM*, V, #155-56, *SRIO*, XXXV, 81, *DZ*, #55, a landholder in Smolensk, probably Orthodox.
- Kostevich, Ianush Stankovich, namestnik of Radun, 1496-1511, *IuZ*, I, #22, *LM*, V, #247, Z, II, #66, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 152, voevoda of Vitebsk, 1514. *DZ*, #136, probably Catholic.
- Kostevich, Stanko, starosta of namestnik of Kovno, 1486-96, Z, I, #86, *ZPL*, p. 72, *ALM*, I, #85, 141-42, *LM*, V, #78, 142, *MHP*, XIV, 440, probably Catholic.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Kostevich, Venslav, pan, received Dersunishki for life, 1510, Liubavsky *Oblastnoe delenie*, #21 (the second so numbered), probably Catholic.
- Kostiushko, starosta of Vladimir, 1442, Halecki, *Ostatnie lata*, p. 300.
- Kot, kliuchnik of Gorodno, before 1502, *DZ*, #45.
- Kozinsky, Olekhno, pan, starosta of Vynista, 1506, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #28, member of an important Volynian family, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 153, possibly Orthodox.
- Krach, Ivan, namestnik of Rechitsa, 1481, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 242.
- Krasovsky, Matvei, del'chii of Luts'k, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #42, pt. 1.
- Krivets, Ivashko, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1493-95, *PSRL*, XII, 234, *LM*, V, #135, a landholder in Smolensk, possibly Orthodox.
- Kroshinsky, Konstantin Feodorovich, prince, uncle of Timofei, kaznachei of Smolensk, 1481-1503, *DZ*, #46, 55, Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, #2, Z, I, #202, namestnik of Belitsa, 1498, a native of the Smolensk region, where he was a large landholder, Orthodox.
- Kroshinsky, Timofei Filipovich, prince, nephew of Konstantin, kaznachei of Smolensk, 1508, *DZ*, #109, Orthodox.
- Kuchiuk, Ian (Iur'evich?), pan, namestnik of Vileika, 1469, *KD*, p. 305, namestnik of Lida, 1473-74, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 4, *MHP*, XIV, 213, possibly the son of Pan Iuri Kuchuk or Konschalk, supporter of the Lithuanian treaty with the Teutonic Order, 1432, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 68, whose alternative name suggests German origin, therefore, probably Catholic.
- Kuchiuk, Voitekh (Ianovich), pan, namestnik of Vladimir, 1494, namestnik of Volkovysk, 1495-1503, *LM*, V, #18, 25, 57, 97, 102, 104, 169, 170, *MHP*, XIV, 459-60, *LM*, V, #247, Z, I, #216. In *LM*, V, #25, 57, 97, 102, 104, Voitekh Kuchiukovich appears as namestnik of "Vo" or "Vl." The editor has filled in the missing letters. In the case of the first two documents he has filled in letters to spell out Volkinitskii, and in the last three, to spell Volkovyskii. I have found no evidence which would make it illogical to consider these five abbreviations as standing for Volodimersky. That would mean that Pan Voitekh was namestnik of Vladimir into 1495. That suggestion receives modest support from the fact that there is a document dated 1496 in which Pan Voitekh appears without title, *LM*, V, #147. That might mean he was shifting posts at this time, and was without a post at the time of the writing of the document. The editor is quite correct in refusing to consider the abbreviation in *LM*, V, #25, as standing for Volkovysk, for according to a latter document, dated August 10, 1494, Pan Ian Dovoinovich was namestnik of Volkovysk, a post which he has held since 1492. The editor may not be correct in considering the abbreviations as standing for Volkiniki in *LM*, V, #169-70. There is no other namestnik of Volkiniki until 1511 when Pan Iakub Kuntsovich appeared. Generally once a post was started, it was continued. Furthermore, the namestnik of Volkiniki was generally listed as of Lepun' as well, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 150-51. Nowhere is Pan Voitek listed as namestnik of Lepun'. Probably Catholic; see Pan Ian Kuchiuk.
- Kuntsovich, Iakub, pan, namestnik of Volkiniki and Lepun', 1511-14, *DZ*, #128.
- Labishchin, Mathias de, palatinus of Brest, 1419, *MHP*, VI, 457, a Polish official, therefore Catholic.
- Leliush, Peter, voevoda of Troki, 1434-40, *RO*, II, #2400-04, *MHP*, XII, 343, 348, *ALM*, I, #5-6, *DZ*, #9, *PSRL*, XVII, 533, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1452, *ALM*, I, #68, at first a supporter of Sigismund Keistutovich, but turned against him 1439 when Sigismund became repressive, probably Catholic.
- Martin, castellanus of Vladimir, 1419, *MHP*, VI, #1345, Catholic.
- Martin Iakubovich, namestnik of Velena, 1504, *KD*, p. 695.
- Matvei Mikitinich, prince, namestnik of Kniazhichi and Teterin, 1502, *IuZ*, I, #37, namestnik of Mogilev, Birsh'tany, and Onikshty, 1503(?) -09, granted Ezdno eternally, 1507, *IuZ*, I, #45.
- Mel'shtinski, Spyt'ko, pan, an autonomous "prince" under Vitovt, controlling part of Podolia, including the cities of Kamenets, Smotrich, Skaloe, Chervenograd, and Bakotoe, 1393-99. After his death his widow sold her husband's lands to Vitovt and Jagailo, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 57-58, Catholic.
- Mezinits, Iatsko, namestnik of Zviagol', 1494-96, *LM*, V, #26, *DZ*, #42.
- Mikel Prokopovich, mytnik of Luts'k, 1505, *DZ*, #89.
- Mikhail, prince, voevoda of Kiev, 1432(?), *PSRL*, XVII, 62, 530-31, date uncertain but early in the struggle between Sigismund and Svidrigailo, supporter of Svidrigailo.
- Mikhailo, pan, koniushii of Vilna, 1497, *LM*, V, #153.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Mikhail Martinovich, pan, namestnik of Merech, 1486-88, *LM*, IV, #4, 10.
- Mikhailo Korsakovich, pan, namestnik of Markov, 1457-83, *ALM*, I, #15, *IuZ*, I, #31.
- Mikhail Sigismundovich, prince, son of Great Prince Sigismund Keistutovich, on his father's assassination in 1440, refused to be satisfied with holdings bestowed upon him by Great Prince Casimir, Bel'sk, Briansk, Surazh in Podliash'e, Kletsk and Koidanov in Vilna, and Briansk and Starodub in Chernigov-Seversk, but took advantage of centrifugal tendencies of lands in the Lithuanian-Russian state in an attempt to secure the throne for himself. Samogitia threw off the rule of Kezgailo, made Mikhail Sigismundovich prince of Samogitia, and selected Kontovtov Dovmont as starosta. With Muscovite help he conquered Kiev, 1442-43, but soon lost it. He remained a threat to Casimir until 1446. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 97, 106-08, *PSRL*, XVII, 541-42. Catholic.
- Mikhno Andreevich, tivun of Krasnosel'sk, 1495, *ALM*, I, #177.
- Mikhno Ivanovich, tivun of Troki, 1492-1504, tivun of Vysokodvor, 1493-94, tivun of Ezdno, 1504, *LM*, III, 35, 22, *ALM*, I, #128, 140, 687, dead by 1506, *ALM*, I, #756, landholder in the area of Troki and Vilna, probably Catholic.
- Mikolai Dorkeevich, pan, tivun of Dovkchi, 1492, *LM*, III, #8, landholder in Pinsk.
- Mishko, Vezhgailovich, pan, namestnik of Vilna of the voevoda of Vilna, 1512, *Z*, II, #78.
- Monivid, pan, voevoda (hauptmann, capitaneus, palatinus) of Vilna, 1396-1405, 1408-25, *RO*, II, 163, *MHP*, VI, 54, 73, *RO*, II, 175, 177, *MHP*, VI, 99-101, 103-04, 121, 164-66, 208, *DZ*, #4, *RO*, II, 193, 195, *MHP*, VI, 231, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, *MHP*, VI, 98, XII, 42, 55, 104, *RO*, II, 207, *MHP*, VI, 327, 457, 548, *KD*, pp. 42, 47, 76, 78, 86, supporter of the Act of Union of 1401 and the Horodlo Union of 1413, he was Catholic.
- Monivid, Ian, pan, son of Monivid, ruled Kiev, 1434, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 83, starosta of Podolia and namestnik of Kamenets, 1436-38, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #3, IV (Book 1), #2, V (Book 1), #1, *MHP* (Part 1), 86, *IuZ*, I, #20, 36-37, voevoda of Troki, 1444-53, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-Russkii seim*, pp. 116, 121, *IuZ*, I, #23(?), 28, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 22, *ALM*, I, #14, *KD*, p. 204, Catholic.
- Monividovich, Voitekh, pan, voevoda of Novgorod (-Litovsk), 1475, *LM*, #1, pt. 12, son of Monivid above, Catholic.
- Montovt, namestnik of Solechniki, 1422, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 51, 55, Catholic, Volynian.
- Montovtovich, Bartosh, pan, namestnik of Bel'sk, 1484, *Z*, I, #85, Catholic.
- Montovtovich, Iuri Mikhailovich, pan, namestnik of Kremenets, 1506-07, voevoda of Kiev, 1507-08, derzhavtsa of Chernigov and Liubech, 1508, *Z*, I, #221, Liubavsky, *Ocherk*, #15, *DZ*, #100, *IuZ*, I, #48, *Z*, II, #33, 37, 38, pt. 2, *PSRL*, XVII, 566, Catholic.
- Montovtovich, Mikhailo, pan, pan of Troki and namestnik of Novgorod, 1482-84, *LM*, IV, #62, 64, 67, *Z*, I, #80-81, 85, *LM*, IV, #84, 86, 90, *ALM*, I, #40, Catholic.
- Montovtovich, Stanislav Bartoshevich, pan, namestnik of Punia, 1493-99, *LM*, III, #14, V, #213, 215, *DZ*, #66, namestnik of Briansk, 1500, *PSRL*, XII, 252, *SRIO*, XLI, 318, 328, 345, Catholic.
- Montukh, voevoda of Solechniki, 1435, *MHP*, XII, 343.
- Montvid, Mikhailo, namestnik of Gorodno, 1422, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 55.
- Montvil, tivun of Radun, 1444, *Z*, I, #22.
- Montygird (Hannusch), namestnik of Polotsk, 1396-97, *MHP*, VI, #135, 139, supporter of the Act of Union of 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, *ZPL*, p. 4, Catholic. He may have been appointed namestnik of Polotsk shortly after Skirgailo took Polotsk from Prince Andrei Olgerdovich, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 17, 23. *MHP*, VI, #524 (R. 255), lists Montygird as namestnik of Polotsk in 1413. That date is wrong, for the contents of the document are essentially the same as *MHP*, VI, #135 (R. 43), which is dated 1396 and because Nemir was already namestnik of Polotsk in 1412.
- Montygirdovich, Piotr, pan, voevoda of Novgorod, 1430-32, 1440-55(?), *MHP*, XII, 244, 256, VI, 907, *SHRM*, #217, *DZ*, #11, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 23, pt. 14, *Z*, I, #544, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 4, namestnik of Kopyl', 1435, *IuZ*, I, #28, 29, *ALM*, I, #14, 68, supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, Catholic, a staunch supporter of Sigismund Keistutovich, who favored incorporating Lithuania into Poland, 1439-40, and who favored close relations with Poland, 1448, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 72, 95, 111, 115-16. During the period 1440-49 he appears only as marshal of Lithuania; his control of Novgorod may have been interrupted during that period, but since there is evidence of no other voevoda of Novgorod, it is likely that he retained control. After 1452, he appears without the title of voevoda of Novgorod, but his continued importance up through 1455, *Z*, I, #57, permits the inference that he retained Novgorod through that date.
- Montygirdovich, Piotr Ianovich, pan, namestnik of Braslavl', 1480-82, *KD*, p. 379, starosta of

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, 1468-90, Z, I, #90, 92, *LM*, IV, #15, 109, 122, voevoda of Troki, 1492-96, *LM*, III, #4-5, 7-8, Z, I, #103, *ZPL*, p. 72, *LM*, III, #14-17, 20, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 3, *LM*, V, #8-10, 13, 17, 21-22, 27, 35, 38, 40, 44, *ALM*, I, #123-24, 219, *LM*, V, #70, 73-75, 77, Z, I, #126, *DZ*, #33, 35, 41, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, descended from Montygird, Catholic. Liubavsky, *Litovskii-russkii seim*, p. 336, gives the dates of his office of voevoda of Troki, as 1490-97, but does not support those dates except by reference to Wolff, *Kniazowie*, who does not support them.
- Mordas, tivun of Oshmiany, 1494, *ALM*, I, #123.
- Mosal'sky, Timofei Vladimirovich, prince, okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1487-93, *SRIO*, XXXV, 3-4, *LM*, III, #17, a member of a Riurikovich family of autonomous princes of the Upper Oka region, Orthodox.
- Mozhaisky, Ivan Andreevich, prince, controlled Briansk after his flight from Moscow to Lithuania, 1450, until his death sometime around 1483, also held Starodub and Gomel during at least part of this period, *PSRL*, VIII, 144, XII, 63, 109, *LM*, IV, #1, pt. 26, V, #1, Z, I, #167, descendant of Dmitri Donskoi, Orthodox.
- Mozhaisky, Semion Ivanovich, prince, controlled Chernigov as his votchina, 1496-1507, 1509, deserting Lithuania, 1500, and allying Chernigov with Moscow, under which it remained except for a brief interval, 1508. He also controlled Starodub and Gomel, his father's lands, and Karachev and Khotiml' which, along with Chernigov, he earned for service to the Great Prince of Lithuania, Z, I, #139, 167; see chapter on individuals. Orthodox.
- Mstislavsky, Iuri Semionovich (Lingven), prince, grandson of Olgerd, namestnik of Smolensk for a brief period, sometime during the years 1440-42, Orthodox. He was a supporter of Svidrigailo, arrested by Sigismund, 1439, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 78, 80, 91, 94, put in jail in Troki, escaped to Novgorod the Great, returned to Lithuania on the accession of Casimir, who gave him his votchina, Mstislavl' and Krichov. He was called by the people of Smolensk to be their namestnik in place of Prince Andrei Dorogobuzhsky, possibly in 1441. He apparently hoped to conquer Vitebsk and Polotsk, but was obliged to flee to Moscow, *PSRL*, XVII, 68, 533, 540, *NL*, pp. 419-21. He returned to Lithuania, 1445, *NL*, p. 424, appearing again in official circles, 1450, Z, I, #53, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 22. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, V (Part 2), 524, identifies him as the namestnik of Smolensk who arrested Isidor and his companion, Semion of Suzdal.
- Mstislavsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, prince, see Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, prince.
- Narbutovich, Stanislav, tivun of Krevo, 1495, *LM*, V, #90, descended from Narbut, a supporter of Mikhail Sigismundovich, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 96, probably Catholic.
- Narbutovich, Voitekh, namestnik of Iasvoine, 1499-1510, namestnik of Ozha and Perelom, 1509-10, Z, I, #169, II, #50, 57, *PSRL*, XIII (Part 1), 10, *SRIO*, XXXV, 486, 490, probably a cousin of Stanislav above, Catholic.
- Nasut (Iuri), sud'ia, then starosta of Drogichin, 1432-40, starosta of Mel'nik, 1440, namestnik of Kamenets, 1444, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-Russkii seim*, pp. 68, 350, *PSRL*, VIII, 537, Z, I, #44, supporter of Svidrigailo, possibly Orthodox.
- Nasutich, Ian, namestnik of Gorodno, 1484, *ALM*, I, #40, son of above, possibly Orthodox.
- Navumovich, Piotr Sestrenets, voskovnichii of Polotsk, 1507, *DZ*, #97, pt. 1.
- Nemir (Johannis), capitaneus of Polotsk, 1412, *MHP*, VI, 231, XII, 55, supporter of the Act of Union of 1401, *ZPL*, pp. 4, *MHP*, VI, 73, held positions of importance in the Lithuanian government, 1404-12, assisting in negotiations with the Teutonic Order, 1404, 1411, *MHP*, VI, 103-04, *RO*, II, 175, 177, 195, *MHP*, XII, 42, Catholic.
- Nemir Grimalich, pan, namestnik of Mel'nik, 1499-1511, namestnik of Lositsa, 1506, *ZPL*, pp. 73-81, *DZ*, #74, 88, 108, Z, II, #70, 73.
- Nemir Iakubovich, pan, namestnik of Mchensk and Liubutsk, 1494, *LM*, V, #50.
- Nemirovich, Andrei Iakubovich, pan, namestnik of Mozyr, 1510, *DZ*, #126, great-grandson of Nemir, Catholic.
- Nemirovich, Iakub Ivanovich, pan, namestnik of Brest, 1483-87, Z, I, #80, *LM*, IV, #12, 62, 83, namestnik of Briansk, 1492, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 293, grandson of Nemir, Catholic.
- Nemirovich, Iuri Iur'evich, pan, voevoda of Krichov, 1511, Z, II, #74, great-grandson of Nemir, Catholic.
- Nemirovich, Mikolai, namestnik of Smolensk, Mtsensk, and Liubutsk, 1467, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 17, not 1456 as stated by Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 194, namestnik of Vitebsk, c. 1473. *LM*, V, #281 mentions him as the namestnik of Vitebsk preceding Pan Ivan Ilinich, who is mentioned as namestnik of Volkovysk, 1473, and namestnik of Vitebsk, 1483; therefore, Mikolai must have been namestnik of Vitebsk at least until 1473 and possibly until 1483. The former date is more likely. Since he was already a leading noble in 1440 when he

- participated in the election of Casimir, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 122, he probably would have been unusually old for an officeholder in 1483. Son of Nemir, he was Catholic.
- Nesvitsky, Feodko, prince, controlled Podolia and Kremenets, 1434; a supporter of Svidrigailo, he had watched over his interests in the south after 1432. On Svidrigailo's advice, he surrendered Podolia to Poland, 1434. The Poles allowed him to rule Podolia and Kremenets and to possess Zbarazh, Vynitsa, and Sokolitsa. Braslavl', however, refused to surrender to Poland, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 78, 83-84, 91. A Riurikovich of the Pinsky-Volynsky family, he was probably Orthodox.
- Nos, Aleksandr, prince, namestnik of Lutsk, 1433-34, Liubavsky, *Litovsko russkii seim*, pp. 79, 83. Poles left him in control of Lutsk, which early in 1433 he brought into Svidrigailo's camp, but which he was compelled to surrender to Sigismund Keistutovich in 1434. A Riurikovich of the Pinsky-Volynsky family, he was probably Orthodox.
- Obolensky, Semion Ivanovich, prince, controlled Briansk as votchina, 1446, *PSRL*, IV, 123, VI, 174-75, VIII, 117, XII, 69. He had fled to Lithuania with Prince Vasilii Iaroslavovich Borovsky, who received Briansk and other cities from Casimir. Prince Vasilii gave Semion Ivanovich Briansk. Orthodox.
- Odoevsky, Iuri Romanovich, prince, may have controlled Liubutsk, 1423, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 128. Odoevskys may have controlled Liubutsk in subsequent decades. Orthodox.
- Olekhno Sudimontovich, pan, namestnik of Gorodno, 1458(?), *AW*, I, 262, namestnik of Polotsk, 1457(?) to 1475, *ALM*, I, #15, *Z*, I, #64, *MHP*, XIV, 173, 213, *LM*, III, #1, pts. 7-8, voevoda of Vilna, 1478-91, *KD*, pp. 362, 435, *MHP*, XIV, 314, *LM*, IV, #73, 76, 78, 63, 67-68, 74, 156, III, #1, pt. 28, IV, #62, 81, 83, *Z*, I, #80-81, 85, *ALM*, I, #40, *LM*, IV, #84, 92, 97, 99, 101, 103-04, 110, *MHP*, II, 298, 301, 314. Either *AW*, I, 262 (1458) or *ALM*, I, #15 (1457) is dated incorrectly, for it is unlikely that Olekhno was namestnik of Polotsk, then of Gorodno, and then of Polotsk. Probably he was namestnik of Gorodno before 1458, for *PSRL*, XVII, 546, mentions him as namestnik of Polotsk in proximity to the date 1457 and Andrei Sakovich last appeared as namestnik of Polotsk, 1455. A son of Pan Sudimont Dirkgeovich, a boiarin of Sigismund Keistutovich, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 67, 350, he probably was Catholic. He was chancellor of Lithuania while he was voevoda of Vilna.
- Olekhnovich, Piotr, pan, namestnik of Olita and Nemoniuny, 1494-1502, *ALM*, I, #128, 257, *LM*, V, #247, namestnik of Skerstomon, 1507-08, *Z*, II, #18, 36, *SRIO*, XXXV, 484, and namestnik of Utsiana, 1512, *Z*, II, #79, a descendant of Olekhno Rimovidovich, brother of Ian Rimovidovich, who was ancestor of the Zaberezinskys and supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, Catholic.
- Olel'ko Vladimirovich, prince, ruled Slutsk and Kopyl' to 1440, ruled Kiev land as otchina, 1440-55, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 24, 37, Orthodox.
- Olizarovsky, Feodor, del'chii of Lutsk, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #42, pt. 1.
- Ol'shanitsky, Mikhail Konstantinovich, prince, starosta of Vladimir, 1446-51, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #6, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 153, Halecki, *Ostatnie lata*, p. 298. A Riurikovich of the Pinsky-Volynsky family, he was probably Orthodox.
- Onushko Kalenikovich, pan, namestnik of Zviagol', 1488, *LM*, IV, #9.
- Oshchovsky, Vanko, del'chii of Lutsk, 1514, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #42, pt. 1.
- Oshushisin, Vasko, namestnik of Krichov, 1508-09, *DZ*, #118, *Z*, II, #48.
- Ostik, capitaneus of Oshmiany, 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, pan of Vilna, 1418-42, *MHP*, XII, 104, VI, 457, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 54, 66-67, *SHRM*, #217, *MHP*, XII, 343, II (pt. 1), 88, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 25. He supported the Act of Union of 1401 and the Horodlo Union of 1413, *ZPL*, pp. 3, 17, 21, and was, therefore, Catholic. He had two sons, Radivil and Stanislav.
- Ostikovich, Grigorii Stanislavovich, namestnik of Onikshty, 1494-1500, namestnik of Merech, 1495-1500, *LM*, III, #29, V, #24, 38, 41, 49, 61, 78, *ALM*, I, #135-36, 139-40, 218, *Z*, I, #125, *LM*, V, #83-84, 90, 106, 117, 120, 123-25, 128-29, 133-34, 149, *ALM*, I, #236, 256, 265, *Z*, I, #133, 144, pt. 1, *ALM*, I, #346, *LM*, II, #30, V, #157, 176, 179-80, 184-85, 187, III, #31, *Z*, I, #159, 163, 167, 170, 172-73, 175, *ZPL*, p. 73, *DZ*, #66, 68-69, *LM*, V, #211-13, 215, 218-24, 227, 230, *PSRL*, XVII, 558, voevoda of Troki, 1511-14, *Z*, II, #64-65, 67-68, 70-71, 73, *DZ*, #133, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #34-35, *SRIO*, XXXV, 497, *Z*, II, #80, 84, *SPS*, #8, 10, *DZ*, #136-37, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #41. *LM*, III, #25, refers to him as namestnik of Merech under the date 1494. That date is wrong, for Pan Stanislav Glebovich held the post of namestnik of Merech throughout 1494 and into 1495, first appearing without the title, July 17, 1495, *LM*, V, #97. *Z*, II, #10, dated 1507,

- lists him as voevoda of Troki. Either the dating of this document is wrong or he was given the post of voevoda in the middle of the term of office of his cousin, Pan Mikolai Mikolae-vich Radivilovich. He was taken prisoner by Muscovite forces during the battle of Mitkov field near the Vedrosha River, July 14, 1500. He was scheduled to succeed Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky as marshal of Lithuania, 1508, but could not because he remained in Muscovite hands, *Z*, II, #41. Clearly then if he was appointed voevoda of Troki in 1507, it was an honorific gesture. The grandson of Ostik, he was Catholic.
- Ostrozhsy, Dashko Feodorovich, prince, seized Kremenets, 1418, *PSRL*, VIII, 90, XVII, 57-58, *U*, p. 72. In the last citation he is wrongly called Feodor Dashkovich. A supporter of Svidri-gailo, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 91, his descendants first joined the Catholic Church, c. 1500, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xvii. Orthodox.
- Ostrozhsy, Feodor Danilovich, prince, ruled Lutsk as prince, 1386-87, receiving it from Prince Feodor Liubartovich, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 40. In 1387 Vitovt apparently got control of Lutsk, and may have appointed Feodor Danilovich as voevoda, for a Prince Feodor appears with that title, 1388, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 16, *Z*, I, #9. He appears in control of Ostrog, 1386-1403, *MHP*, II (pt. 1), 8, VI, 41, 92. During that period his votchina apparently included Brodov, Radoselki, Radogoshch, Mezirche, Diakov, Svishchov, Ozierany, Gorodnitsa, Dvastavki, Zaslav, and possibly Kosmich and Kuznitsa. A Riurikovich, father of above mentioned Dashko, he was Orthodox.
- Ostrozhsy, Konstantin Ivanovich, prince, namestnik of Braslavl' and Vynitsa, and probably also of Zvenigorod, although he did not appear in documents with that title, 1498-1500, *LM*, V, #223, 225, *Z*, I, #138, 174, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 262, starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, 1500-01, *DZ*, #71, all of the above posts, 1507-14, and pan of Vilna, 1511-14, and ruler of Zviagol', 1507 on, *Z*, II, #29, 31, 45, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #23, pt. 5, #31, pt. 1, *DZ*, #117, *Z*, II, #53, 65-65, 84, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #35, 37-38, 42, pt. 1, *SPS*, #10. *ALM*, I, #225, lists him as hetman, starosta of Lutsk, namestnik of Braslavl' and Vynitsa, marshal of the Volynia land, under the date of 1495. That date must be wrong, for Prince Semion Iur'evich Gol'shansky was starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land in 1495. Another error in dating occurs, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #23, pt. 4, which lists Ostrozhsy as voevoda of Troki under the date 1507, a post he first held in 1522. His tenure of office was interrupted by his imprisonment by Muscovite troops on Mitkov field, July 14, 1500, *PSRL*, XII, 252, XVII, 342. He escaped from Moscow, 1507, *PSRL*, XVII, 185, 344. He probably was appointed starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, for Prince Semion Iur'evich Gol'shansky appears with those titles, only 1494-99, 1502-05, during the interval appearing as voevoda of Novgorod. Mention of Ostrozhsy as starosta of Lutsk and marshal of the Volynia land, *DZ*, #71, may refer to titles bestowed upon him just before he was captured. Probably this document should be dated 1500 rather than 1501; otherwise it is difficult to explain Ostrozhsy's approving the contents, as the document states. Orthodox, *Z*, II, #65.
- Ostrozhsy, Mikhail Ivanovich, Prince, starosta of Lutsk, 1505, *PSRL*, XVII, 566, probably for only a short time between the death of his predecessor, Prince Semion Iur'evich Gol'shansky and his own. *ALM*, I, #553 lists him with that post in 1500. Either the date is wrong, or, more likely, his name was substituted for that of his brother Konstantin. *IuZ*, II, #80, might suggest that he was never appointed, for no title is listed when reference is made to the late Mikhail, 1507. Orthodox.
- Pashko Daokhnovich, pan, starosta of Vladimir, 1451, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #6, Halecki *Ostatnie lata*, p. 299, grandfather of Pan Stanislav Petrashkovich Kishka. Catholic(?).
- Patrikeevich, Alexander, prince, received Starodub from Skirgailo, 1397, and got Briansk, possibly on the death of Prince Roman Briansky, 1401. Probably held them until 1406 when he plotted to betray Vitovt and was arrested, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 176, 179-80, 218, *PSRL*, VIII, 75, *MHP*, VI, 136-37, 150. He may have controlled Liubutsk, 1402, when he fought for it against Riazan and lost, *PSRL*, XVII, 48, *TL*, p. 455.
- Pats Girdividovich, pan, pan of Troki, 1452, *IuZ*, I, #28-29, *ALM*, I, #14, 68, starosta of Lida, 1453, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 120, a supporter of Sigismund Keistutovich. *Ibid.*, p. 68, *MHP*, XII, 343, his son, Iuri, labeled Catholic, Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 228. Catholic.
- Patsovich, Iuri, pan, voevoda of Kiev, 1486-89, *LM*, IV, #5, 104, 118-20, *Z*, I, #93, *SRIO*, XXXV, 11, called namestnik in the last citation, namestnik of Novgorod, 1492-96, *ZPL*, p. 72, *LM*, V, #1, *Z*, I, #108, *ALM*, I, #135-36, 160, 174, 185, *LM*, V, #70, 74, 135, 144, namestnik of Polotsk, 1496-1502, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, *Z*, I, #141, 147, 149, 170, 172,

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- DZ, #68, ZPL, p. 73, MHP, XIV, 459, LM, V, #219, 222, 224, 232, namestnik of Merech, 1505, DZ, #87, son of above Pats, Catholic.
- Petkovich, Stanislav Mikhailovich, pan, namestnik of Brest, 1498-1504, DZ, #57, ZPL, pp. 73, 81, DZ, #83.
- Petrash, pan, namestnik of Trubchevsk, presumably before 1452, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 181.
- Petrashko Pashkovich, pan, namestnik of Lida, 1483, Z, I, #80-81, LM, IV, #62, 87.
- Polozovich, Semion Feodorovich, pan, kliuchnik of Kiev, 1493-99, LM, III, #23, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #16, LM, V, #23, 59, DZ, #26, 40, *ALM*, #264, DZ, #54, 64, namestnik of Ovruch', 1510-14, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #20 (incorrectly numbered 21), *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #41, member of a Pinsk family of princely descent, see footnote to last citation, Orthodox.
- Polubensky, Vasilii Andreevich, prince, namestnik of Vladimir, 1502, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #13, last mention of an Orthodox member of family, 1634, first mention of a Catholic member, c. 1629, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxiii, Orthodox.
- Prazhovsky, Andrei, zemianin, namestnik of Zhitomir, after 1506, *AluZ*, VII (Book 2), #111.
- Pronsky, Gleb, prince, namestnik of Ostryń, 1501, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 158, Orthodox.
- Protasiev, Grigorii, voevoda of Mchensk, 1423-37, Kuczynski *Ziemie*, pp. 128-29, 194, 436, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 68-69, 86. His tenure of office was interrupted by his imprisonment by Tatars. He was returned, 1431, XII, 256. Catholic.
- Prus, Kondrat, voevoda of Kremenets, 1418, ousted by Prince Dashko Feodorovich Ostrozhsky, *PSRL*, VIII, 90, XVII, 57, *U*, p. 72. His name suggests German origin. Catholic.
- Puchitsky, Rachko, pan, namestnik of Mel'nik and sud'ia of Belsk, 1495, LM, V, #87-88.
- Putiatic, Dmitri Ivanovich, prince, namestnik of Mtsensk and Liubutsk, to 1487, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, Z, I, #58 (incorrectly dated 1456), namestnik of Briansk, 1487-88, LM, IV, #102, 112, 113, voevoda of Kiev, 1492-1505, LM, III, #7, Z, I, #107, LM, V, #23, Z, I, #141, 145, pt. 2, 151, LM, V, #202, 211, 212, Z, I, #165, 170, *SRIO*, XLI, 262, 330-33, 360, 488, Z, #183, 196, 207, *PSRL*, XVII, 566. He is mentioned in the last reference as dying, and in Z, I, #224 (1506) as the "late" voevoda. *SRIO*, XXXV, 10, under the date, October 7, 1487, refers to him as "Menskii." Probably the letter for *ch* was dropped accidentally; its inclusion would produce Mchsenskii, or of Mchensk, which today is called Mtsensk. Thus he was probably namestnik of Mtsensk and Liubutsk until 1487. He headed missions to Mengli-Girei, Khan of the Crimea, 1493 and 1501-03. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia*, IV, 223, calls him Orthodox. That conclusion is strengthened by the fact that he was a member of the Drutsky princely family and that his father Prince Ivan Semionovich was a supporter of Svidrigailo, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 67-68, 91.
- Radivil, pan, pan of Vilna and voevoda of Troki, 1444, possibly until his death in 1447, *IuZ*, #22. A supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413, ZPL, pp. 18, 21, and an official in Vitovt's government, 1411-30, *RO*, II, 195, MHP, 794, DZ, #60, he was Catholic.
- Radivil Ostikovich, pan, voevoda of Troki, 1466-82, LM, III, #1, pts. 3-4, and 820, MHP, XIV, 173, 214, DZ, #14, lists him as voevoda under the date 1488. That is impossible since Bogdan Andreevich Sakovich was voevoda at that time. Son of the Samogitian boyar, Ostik, who supported the Act of Union of 1401 and the Horodlo Union of 1413, he was Catholic. From him is descended the Radivil or Radziwil family.
- Radivil, Ian Mikolaevich, pan, namestnik of Vileika, 1495-1503, LM, V, #112, 226, ZPL, p. 81, DZ, #75, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, pt. 1, namestnik of Slonim, 1507-09, 1511-12, *SRIO*, XXXV, 488, Z, II, #66, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #2, 30, pt. 1, nephew of Albert, bishop of Vilna, Catholic.
- Radivil, Iuri Mikolaevich, pan, namestnik of Eishishki, 1499, namestnik of Merech, 1505-14, namestnik of Moishagol'e, 1506-07, namestnik of Vlena, 1507-08, namestnik of Dovkchi and Zhizhmory, 1509, voevoda of Kiev and namestnik of Mozyr, 1512-14, ZPL, p. 73, DZ, #88, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #2, DZ, #100, 119, Z, II, #76, 79, 80, pt. 2, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #36, pt. 1, #41, DZ, #136, namestnik of Gorodno, 1514, Z, II, #87, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #2 bears the date 1509. Brother of the above, Catholic.
- Radivil, Mikolai, pan, namestnik of Smolensk, 1475-86, Z, I, #70, 78, LM, IV, #72-73, 77, 92-94, 97, V, #156, namestnik of Bel'sk and namestnik of Novgorod (Litovsk), 1488, and pan of Troki, 1488-90, LM, IV, #21, 121, MHP, II, pt. 2, 298, 301, voevoda of Vilna, 1492-1507, *SRIO*, XXXV, 64, 71, ZPL, p. 72, LM, V, #1, 4-5, Z, I, #100, LM, III, #2, 4, 8, 11, 13, 16, 23, 24, V, #145, Z, I, #103, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #14, LM, V, #6-9, 11, 13, 17, 30, 32-33, 35, 37-38, 41, 45, 60-61, *ALM*, I, #85, 123-24, 135, 141, Z, I, 118-20, 125-26, 129-31, DZ, #29, *ALM*, I, #151, 190, LM, V, #52, 56, 58-60, 62, 64-65, 68,

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- 70-71, 73-77, 89, 94, 103, 124-25, 129, 131, 133-35, 142, 144, 147, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #13, pt. 3, #16, *Z*, I, #133, 144-47, *LM*, III, #34, *DZ*, #47, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, *LM*, V, #155, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #23, *Z*, I, #158, 163, 169-72, 176, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #22, *ZPL*, p. 73, *MHP*, XIV, 459, *DZ*, #66, 69, *LM*, V, #187-88, 209-12, 214-15, 218-19, 223-24, 229, 231, 238-39, 243, *Z*, I, #181, *IuZ*, I, #36, *LM*, V, #247, 255, 259-61, *Z*, I, #201, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, pt. 1, *Z*, I, #204, 206-07, 213, 224, II, #8, 10. While voevoda of Vilna, he was chancellor of Lithuania. Brother of Albert, bishop of Vilna, and grandson of Ostik, he was Catholic. He married Sophia Rogatinskaia. Ian, Iuri, Mikolai, and Piotr were his sons.
- Radivil, Mikolai Mikolaevich, namestnik of Braslavl', 1493, *LM*, III, #18, namestnik of Bel'sk, 1494-1505, *LM*, V, #46, 175, 188, *ZPL*, p. 73, *Z*, I, #163, *LM*, V, #243, *DZ*, #8, pt. 2, *ZPL*, p. 78, *LM*, V, #247, *DZ*, #83, *PSRL*, XVII, 559, 567, *ALM*, I, #264, and *MHP*, XIV, 459, list him as namestnik of Brest under the dates 1496 and 1499 respectively. I believe these should read Bel'sk. To be sure there is no other namestnik of Brest listed for 1496, but Pan Stanislav Petkovich was namestnik of Brest, 1498-1504. Furthermore, *MHP*, XIV, 459 and *ZPL*, 73, are competing texts of the same document. The former lists Mikolai as namestnik of Brest and the latter, Stanislav. One is in error. Consistency suggests *MHP*, XIV, 459, is wrong. He was voevoda of Troki, 1505-10, *DZ*, #87-88, 92, *Z*, I, #234, II, #4, I, #108-09, *SPS*, #7, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #16, *Z*, II, #8, 25, 29, pt. 1, #30, 40, 49-50, *DZ*, #117, *IuZ*, I, #66, and voevoda of Vilna, 1510-14, *IuZ*, I, #56, *DZ*, #120, 133, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #34, *Z*, II, #64-65, 67-71, 73, 80, *SRIO*, XXXV, 497, *Z*, II, #83-84, *DZ*, #136, 139, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #31, Catholic.
- Radivil, Piotr Mikolaevich, pan, namestnik of Eishishki, 1496-99, *ALM*, I, #260, *ZPL*, p. 73, erroneously called pan of Vilna in first citation, Catholic.
- Rezanovich, Kozarin, pan, marshal of the Lutsk land, 1437-38, 1443, Halecki, *Ostatnie lata*, p. 301.
- Rezanovich, Nemir, pan, namestnik of Briansk during part of the period 1432-38, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 177, possibly only 1434, Halecki, *Ostatnie lata*, pp. 301-02, starosta of Lutsk, 1450-52, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #7, 10, pts. 4-5. Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 153, asserts 1445-51. He overlooked the tenure of Prince Feodor Mikhailovich Czartoryski and Iuri Ivanovich, as well as *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #10, pt. 5 (1452).
- Rogatinsky, Ivashko, pan, namestnik of Kletsk, 1441, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 15, and namestnik of Kamenets, 1461, *ALM*, I, #18, possibly the father-in-law of Pan Mikolai Radivil, Catholic.
- Roman Ivashkovich, pan, namestnik of Putivl', 1476-82, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, *LM*, IV, #75, namestnik of Ovruch', 1486-87, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), #1, VIII (Book 6), #2, *LM*, IV, #13.
- Romanovich, Gorostai, pan, namestnik of Ovruch', 1489-93, *LM*, IV, #6, III, #24, *DZ*, #21, Orthodox, see Semion below.
- Romanovich, Semion, pan, namestnik of Zhitomir, 1488, *LM*, IV, #104, namestnik of Ovruch', 1506, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), 14, a landholder in the area of Ovruch', and a grantor of land to the Nikolaevsky monastery of Kiev, 1507, *AluZ*, I (Book 6), #5, Orthodox.
- Romanovich, Volochko, namestnik of Ovruch', 1478, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), 8, Orthodox, see Semion above.
- Rumbold, hauptmann of Samogitia, 1409-11, Fijałek and Semkowicz, *Kodeks dyplomatyczny*, p. 86, *MHP*, VI, 183-84, starosta of Vitebsk, 1422, Liubavsky *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 54, voevoda of Vilna, 1430, *ibid.*, p. 69. Appears as Rumbold Sunigailonis, *MHP*, XII, 42, 244, thus may have been related to Sunigailo, Catholic.
- Sakovich, Andrei Iuchkovich, pan, capitaneus of Dubinich, 1435, *MHP*, XII, 343, voevoda of Smolensk, 1440, *PSRL*, XVII, 540, appointed by Sigismund, ousted on his death by Kievans, reappointed c. 1442, by Casimir, after ousting of Prince Iuri Semionovich Lingven Mstislavsky, namestnik of Polotsk, 1444-57, voevoda of Troki, 1458, *KD*, p. 252, *ALM*, I, #40 (1484), he represented Lithuania at the Seim of 1453, Liubavsky *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 120, probably the grandson of Saka, a supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, Catholic.
- Sakovich, Bogdan Andreevich, pan, namestnik of Braslavl', 1469-74, *KD*, p. 305, Papée, *Polska i Litwa*, I, 84, *MHP*, XIV, 213, namestnik of Polotsk, 1480(?) -84, *Z*, I, #78, 85, *LM*, IV, #62-63, 67, 74, 78, 80, 81, 86, and voevoda of Troki, 1484-90, *ALM*, I, #40, *LM*, IV, #97, 127, *Z*, I, #70, *MHP*, II (pt. 2), 298, 301, Catholic.
- Samodelka, mytnik of Kiev, 1488, *SRIO*, XXXV, 11.
- Sangushkovich, Andrei Aleksandrovich, prince, namestnik of Braslavl', c. 1501, after the imprisonment of Prince Konstantin Ivanovich Ostrozhsy, his predecessor, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe*

- delenie*, p. 154(?), Wolff, *Kniazowie*, pp. 424-25. Wolff asserts that he was also namestnik of Vynitsa, 1501. I have found no substantiation of this. Inasmuch as many of the namestniki of Braslavl' also held the post of namestnik of Vynitsa, it is a not unreasonable guess that he was namestnik of Vynitsa, c. 1501. He was namestnik of Kremenets, 1506, Z, I, #221. Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 232, refers to him as namestnik of Kaments. I believe this is an error for Kremenets. Prince Semion Aleksandrovich Czartoryski is listed as namestnik of Kamenets, 1507. Last names of princes frequently were omitted in documents. Hence, the simple error of a scribe in substituting Andrei for Semion would produce Andrei Aleksandrovich. He was namestnik of Vladimir, possibly 1508-14, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 425, Z, II, #80. A descendant of Prince Feodor Olgerdovich, an important landholder of Volynia, whose descendants first joined the Catholic Church, c. 1620, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxi, he was Orthodox.
- Sangushkovich, Vasilii Mikhailovich, prince, namestnik of Braslavl', c. 1490, at the end of the reign of Casimir, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 154; see Andrei above, Orthodox.
- Sanko, mytnik of Kiev, 1497-99, *DZ*, #54, 64.
- Semion Olel'kovich, prince of Kiev, 1455-70, *PSRL*, XVII, 549, Z, I, #163, received Kiev as otchina from Kazimir, not allowed to share Kiev with his brother Mikhail, who had to be content with Kopyl', Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 36, Orthodox.
- Senko, pan of Vilna, 1477, *KD*, p. 357.
- Senko Androshevich, tivun of Radun', 1488, *LM*, IV, #20.
- Senko Olizarovich, pan, namestnik of Brest, 1494-95, *LM*, V, #61, 72, 102.
- Shamak Danilovich, mytnik of Lutsk, 1506, Z, II, #1.
- Shchitovich, Ian Iakubovich, pan, namestnik of Vasilishki, 1508, *DZ*, #112-13, derzhavtsa of Kiev, 1511, Z, II, #74.
- Shedibor Volimuntovich, pan, brother of Kezgailo, namestnik of Kovno, 1418-21, *MHP*, VI, 413-14, 537. On the last page reference is made to a letter of the hauptmann of Kovno, the letter having been identified, *ibid.*, p. 414, as from Shedibor; consequently, he was probably namestnik, 1421. He was namestnik of Vilkomir, 1424-25, *MHP*, VI, 643, 709, Catholic.
- Shikhma, mytnik of Kiev, 1488, *SRIO*, XXXV, #2, pt. 3, Jewish.
- Shimok Kibirovovich, pan, namestnik of Zholubok, 1511, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 158-59.
- Sigismund Keistutovich, prince, ruled Novgorod (Litovsk), 1882-85, Chichersk, 1401-30, Gomel, Rechitsa, Starodub, and Briansk, 1408-30, the last two probably to 1432, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 176-80, Great Prince of Lithuania in competition with Svidrigailo, 1432-37, alone, 1437-40, when he was assassinated.
- Skirgailo Olgerdovich, prince, regional prince of Troki, 1382-83, 1384-88, *RO*, II, 131, 139, not only from 1384 as Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 16, voevoda of Smolensk, 1386, *U*, p. 63, between death in battle of Great Prince Sviatoslav Ivanovich Smolensky, and the accession of his son, Great Prince Iuri, whose wife was Skirgailo's niece, prince of Polotsk, 1386-94(-95?), *U*, p. 63. In 1487 his holdings were so expanded that he was nearly ruler of Lithuania, *MHP*, II, pt. 1, 9-10. In 1389 he appears as Great Prince of Lithuania, *RO*, II, 141. In 1391 Jagailo promised not to give away Skirgailo's towns, including Vilna and Vitebsk. In the struggle between Vitovt and Jagailo he lost his position, *MHP*, VI, 32, being compelled in 1394-95, to accept Kiev, Kremenets and Starodub, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 179. He died in 1397. Catholic.
- Smolensky, Iuri Sviatoslavovich, Great Prince of Smolensk, 1386-95, 1401-04, *PSRL*, VIII, 72, 75-77, 87, VII, 52, 272-74, 323-24, 290, *TL*, pp. 431-32, 454, 457, *U*, pp. 63, 69-70. Married to Skirgailo's niece and a supporter of the Krevo Union, *MHP*, II, pt. 1, 7, he may well have embraced Catholicism. He was placed in control of Smolensk by Skirgailo after the latter had conquered Smolensk in a battle in which Iuri's father was killed. Vitovt seized Smolensk, 1395. With the help of Prince Oleg Riazansky, Iuri regained Smolensk, 1401. As a result of a seven-week siege by Vitovt and Iuri's loss of the support of the people of Smolensk, he lost Smolensk and his wife was captured and sent back to Lithuania. He died in Riazan, 1407.
- Smolensky, Sviatoslav Ivanovich, great prince of Smolensk to 1386, father of above, died fighting Lithuanian troops under Skirgailo, descendant of Rostislav.
- Sokolinsky, Semion Feodorovich, prince, namestnik of Briansk, 1492, *SRIO*, XXXV, 58.
- Sologub, Iuri Andreevich, pan, namestnik of Smolensk, 1503-07, *LM*, V, #264, *DZ*, #107, Z, II, #9, 16-24, namestnik and voevoda of Smolensk, 1514, *PSRL*, XIII, pt. 2, 19-20, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #24, *U*, pp. 104-05.
- Soltan Aleksandrovich, pan, namestnik of Slonim, 1483-90, namestnik of Novgorod, 1486, Z, I, #80-81, *LM*, IV, #62, 70, 83, 88, Z, I, #89, *LM*, IV, #126, namestnik of Bel'sk, 1493-94,

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- ALM*, I, #85, *LM*, V, #27, of Russian origin, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 350, his last descendant mentioned as Orthodox, 1647, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxviii, Orthodox.
- Sopega, Bogdan Semionovich, pan, namestnik of Mchensk and Liubutsk, 1494-96, *LM*, V, #28-29, 135, not only in 1496 as Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 296, 346, namestnik of Vysokodvor, 1503-08, and okol'nichii of Smolensk, 1508-12, *Z*, II, #18, 36, 80, pt. 2, *DZ*, #109, *SRIO*, XXXV, 484, brother of Ivan, Catholic, 1514, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xv, therefore Orthodox while officeholder.
- Sopega, Ivan Bogdanovich, pan, gorodnichii of Troki, 1511, *Z*, II, #72, probably still Orthodox at this time, see Bogdan.
- Sopega, Ivan Semionovich, pan, namestnik of Braslavl', 1502-14, namestnik of Zhizhmory, 1502-06, namestnik, later voevoda of Vitebsk, 1509-12, voevoda of Podliash'e, 1513-14, *Z*, I, #198, *PSRL*, XVII, 564, *IuZ*, I, #41, *Z*, I, #224, *SRIO*, XXXV, 486, *VK*, VII, #1 *IuZ*, I, #56-57, *DZ*, #125, *Z*, II, #61, 66, 70-74, *DZ*, #128, 133, *AluZ* (Book 4), #30, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 334, scribe, marshal of Lithuania, Catholic, c. 1514, thus probably Orthodox except as voevoda of Podliash'e, and in last years as namestnik of Braslavl'. *DZ*, #88 lists him under date 1505 as namestnik of Vitebsk. The date of the document may be incorrect, but I am more inclined to suspect the attribution of Vitebsk. The document seems correct in other respects. The Sopegas probably originated in Smolensk, where Vasilii Semionovich Sopega, a dvorianin, was an extensive landholder, *LM*, V, #55-56, 58, 130, 236, and whence Muscovite troops took Vasilii's wife, c. 1512, *Z*, II, #80, pt. 2.
- Stanislav Ivanovich, voevoda of Troki, 1419, *MHP*, VI, 457, Catholic.
- Strynel, Iuri, tivun of Zholubok, 1493-95, *LM*, V, #24, 90.
- Stromilko, Matsko, namestnik of Mednik, 1467, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 2.
- Stanislav Stetskovich, namestnik of Drogichin, 1501, *DZ*, #74.
- Sudivoi Volimuntovich, pan, namestnik of Kovno, 1449-51, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 23, *Z*, I, #54, pan of Vilna, 1452, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #9, pt. 4, *IuZ*, I, #28-29, *ALM*, I, #14, #68 (incorrectly dated 1492), *KD*, p. 232, probably succeeded his brother, Kezgailo, as pan of Vilna, and he may have been one of the other unnamed brothers who with Kezgailo supported the Act of Union of 1401, *MHP*, VI, 73, *ZPL*, p. 4, Catholic.
- Sudivoevich, Stanko, pan, namestnik of Gorodno, 1469-75, *MHP*, XIV, 173, 213, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 12, *KD*, p. 305, son of Sudivoi Volimuntovich, Catholic.
- Sunigailo Ian, hauptmann of Kovno, 1409-15, 1422, pan of Troki, 1413-31, *MHP*, VI, 172, 208, *RO*, II, 193, *ZPL*, pp. 17, 21, *AUPL*, pp. 57, 69, *MHP*, VI, 302, 327, 457, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 54, 66. Substantiation of the date 1422 is dependent upon Liubavsky's interpretation, *ibid.*, p. 54. He read as castellan Sunigailo Svidrigail, castellan of Troki and starosta of Kovno, the twentieth signatory of the Lithuanian Prussian Convention, appearing in *Codex diplomaticus*, IV, 115. That interpretation involves the assumption that Sunigailo lost the post of namestnik of Kovno and regained it, c. 1422, for Shedibor Volimuntovich was namestnik of Kovno, 1418-21. Such a development was not common early in the fifteenth century. Catholic, supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413.
- Svidrigailo Olgerdovich, prince, ruled Vitebsk, briefly 1392 or 1393, Podolia, c. 1400-02, perhaps Liubutsk and Rechitsa, sometime before 1408, Briansk and Starodub, 1406-08, Chernigov, Trubchevsk, Novgorod-Seversk, from 1420-22 to 1430, when he was elected Great Prince of Lithuania; he ruled alone to 1432, and in competition with Sigismund Keistutovich, 1432-38, when he was ousted, Eastern Podolia and Volynia, 1442-52, Gomel, 1447-52, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 21, *RO*, II, 171, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 176, 180, 190-191, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, pp. 58-60, Halecki, *Ostatnie lata*, pp. 43-44, Catholic.
- Tovtko, namestnik of Polotsk, 1422, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 54.
- Trubetskoi, Iuri Mikhailovich, prince, controlled one-half of Trubchevsk from c. 1452, *Z*, I, #125, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 247-49, Orthodox.
- Trubetskoi, Ivan Iur'evich, prince, controlled one-half of Trubchevsk from 1495 or earlier, *Z*, I, #125, *LM*, V, #62, deserted to Moscow, probably 1500, *Z*, I, #194, namestnik of Mchensk and Liubutsk, 1487-90, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, *SRIO*, XXXV, 19, 49, Orthodox.
- Tsibul', mytnik of Kiev, 1497-99, *DZ*, #54, 64.
- Uliana, princess, widow of Olgerd, controlled Vitebsk with help of her sons Jagailo and Skirgailo, until her death, 1392, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 21.
- Uliana, wife of Vitovt, granted Novgorod (-Litovsk), Doliatichi, Liubcha, Polbereg, Bassin, Negnevichi, Polona, Korelichi, Bretena, Ostashin, Sverzhen', Pochapov, Polonka, Liakhnovichi, and a few other villages in the Novgorod area, and Voidatovo selo in Troki, *MHP*, VI, 792, which she may have enjoyed until her death, 1448, in spite of the fact that Pan Piotr Montygird was voevoda from 1430.

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- Vasilii Iaroslavovich (Borovsky), prince, received Briansk, Gomel, Starodub, and Mstislavl', in flight from Moscow, 1446, gave Briansk to Prince Semion Ivanovich Obolensky, probably returned to Moscow, 1447, *PSRL*, VIII, 117, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, pp. 54, 177, 180, Orthodox.
- Vasilii Ivanovich (Zheslavsky?), prince, derzhavtsa of Kernov, 1507, *Z*, II, #10.
- Vasilii Semionovich Krasnyi (Drutsky), voevoda of Vilna, 1430-32(?), Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 69, replaced Rumbold, dates uncertain, but possibly through the uncontested part of Svidrigailo's reign. Orthodox.
- Vasko Dashkovich, gorodnichii of Kovno, 1511, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #22, appointed for life.
- Vasko Doreshkovich, podkoniushii of Vilna, 1494, *LM*, V, #24.
- Vereisky, Vasilii Mikhailovich, prince, donee of Liubech', Volozhin, and other towns, 1483, *LM*, IV, #79-81, which he controlled with additional villages until at least 1499, *LM*, V, #209. He may have died during the war, 1500-03, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 47.
- Veshtortovich, Mishko, pan, namestnik of Slonim, 1471, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 6.
- Vesna, Feodor, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1392, from death of Uliana to his assassination by Svidrigailo, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 21.
- Vezgailo, koniushii of Vilna, 1433, *KD*, p. 147.
- Viazhevich, Ivan, pan, namestnik of Smolensk, 1459-66, voevoda of Troki, 1466, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 10, *KD*, p. 379, supporter of Svidrigailo, *PSRL*, XVII, 530. Catholic, for daughter endowed church.
- Viazhevich, Mikhailo, tivun of Prelai, 1494-96, *LM*, V, #38, 128, *DZ*, #41, *ALM*, I, #236.
- Viazmiatin, Ivan, podkliuchii of Vilna, 1514, *DZ*, #139.
- Vigunt Olgerdovich, prince of Kernov, at least 1385-87, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 10, *ZPL*, p. 2.
- Vitovt, Keistutovich, prince, ruled Troki, 1384, *RO*, II, 133, Gorodno, 1386-90, Brest, 1387, Lutsk, 1387-92, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 16, *MHP*, II, pt. 1, 6, VI, #35, #63-64, *RO*, II, 143; by 1392 had gained control of most of Lithuania; ruled as Jagailo's viceroy to 1401; great prince, 1401-30, Catholic.
- Vladimir Olgerdovich, prince, ruled Kiev to 1394 or 1395 when ousted by Vitovt, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 20, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 179. Then given Kopyl', he was the ancestor of later princes of Kiev, Olel'ko and Semion, Orthodox.
- Vodyn, pisar of Drogichin, 1495, *LM*, V, #87-88.
- Vodynsky, Mikhail, sud'ia of Drogichin, 1507, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #14.
- Voinitsky, Ian, pan, starosta of Lutsk and Olesin, 1438, *Z*, I, #35, last mention of a descendant as Orthodox, 1634, *AluZ*, IV (Book 1), xxiv, Orthodox.
- Voitekh Ivashkovich, pan, namestnik of Dersunishki, 1495, *LM*, V, #15.
- Volochkovich, Nekrash, namestnik of Belitsa, 1499, *ZPL*, pp. 72, possibly a descendant of Volochko, a signer of the Union of 1401, *ZPL*, p. 4, Catholic.
- Vorotynsky, Dmitri Feodorovich, prince, namestnik of Kozelsk to 1490, when he fled to Moscow, apparently removing Kosel'sk from within Lithuania, *SRIO*, XXXV, 48. The identification of his father as namestnik, whom he probably succeeded. See below. A Riurikovich, member of a local autonomous princely family, Orthodox.
- Vorotynsky, Feodor L'vovich, prince, namestnik of Kozel'sk, 1447(?) on. Feodor probably joined Lithuania, 1447, see chapter on individuals, and may have brought Kozel'sk with him. At least it is reported as being part of Lithuania, 1447, *ODB*, 24, #233. He is mentioned as namestnik, February 5, 1448, *Z*, I, #48, when he insisted that Prince Ivan Andreevich Mozhaitsky had no right to make Kozel'sk part of Moscow. Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, argues that he was namestnik. That probably is supported by a document, dated 1455, *Z*, I, #57, *LM*, III, #1, pt. 11, which specifies the votchina which Feodor had received from Casimir for service. Kozel'sk was not included in that specification; therefore, Feodor must have controlled it, not as a landholder, but as an official, a namestnik. A Riurikovich, member of an autonomous princely local family, Orthodox.
- Zaberezinsky, Ian Ianovich, pan, namestnik of Volkovysk, 1507-09, *Z*, II, #29, pt. 1, #41, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #31, pt. 1, *Z*, II, #50, voevoda of Novgorod, 1510-13, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #18, *Z*, II, #65, 84, son of below, Catholic.
- Zaberezinsky, Ian Iur'evich, pan, namestnik of Polotsk, 1484-96, pan of Troki, 1490-99, namestnik of Novgorod, 1496-98, voevoda of Troki, 1498-1505, namestnik of Gorodno, 1506-07, *ALM*, #1, #40, *MHP*, II, pt. 2, 298, 301, *SRIO*, XXXV, 68, *LM*, III, #8, V, #1, 3, *ZPL*, p. 72, *Z*, I, #103, *LM*, III, #13, *Z*, I, #110, *LM*, V, #34-35, 30, 70, 74-75, *Z*, I, #126, *ALM*, I, #147, 161, 244, *LM*, V, #119, 134, *MHP*, XIV, 438, 440, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, *LM*, V, #155, 170, 175-76, *DZ*, #59, *Z*, I, #159, 163, *LM*, V, #187-88, *MHP*, XIV,

APPENDIX II: LOCAL OFFICEHOLDERS

- 458, 465-67, ZPL, p. 73, DZ, #68-69, LM, V, #228, 235, 239, 243, Z, I, #182, 191-92, pts. 4, 6, ZPL, p. 78, DZ, #71, 75, LM, V, #247, 252, 258-61, *AluZ*, V (Book 1), #4, pt. 1, Z, I, #201, 206-07, 224, PSRL, XVII, 343, 567, Z, I, #226, II, #2, 4, 8, 25, pts. 1, 3, #30, DZ, #95-96, 103, SPS, #7. Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 332, footnote 70, states that Zaberezinsky became voevoda of Troki, 1497; however, documents, dated early 1498, still label him namestnik of Novgorod. He may have held both posts but apparently Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, p. 336, decided that was uncertain, for he was not specific about dates in this later work. Z, I, #224 lists Zaberezinsky as voevoda of Troki under the date 1506, which probably should be 1505 for he was deprived of his post at the meeting of the *seim* of that year, PSRL, XVII, 343. He was assassinated by Prince Mikhail L'vovich Glinsky, his competitor, February 1508, PSRL, XVII, 185, 289. A descendant of Ian Rimovidovich, supporter of the Horodlo Union of 1413, ZPL, pp. 17, 21, AUPL, pp. 57, 69, cousin of the Olekhnovich, father of Ian and Stanislav, he was Catholic.
- Zaberezinsky, Stanislav Ianovich, pan, namestnik of Braslavl', 1500-01, LM, V, #237, DZ, #74-75, son of above, Catholic.
- Zanko Ivanovich, pan, gorodnichii of Vilna, 1512, Z, II, #78, pt. 1.
- Zavishenits, Ian, pan, namestnik of Briansk, 1486(?) -87, Kuczynski, *Ziemie*, p. 346, SRIO, XXXV, 11. It may be he who is mentioned as Ivanov Mikolai, voevoda of Briansk, 1487, SRIO, XXXV, 11, #1, pt. 2.
- Zbarazhsky, Mikhail Vasil'evich, prince, namestnik of Braslavl', 1504-07, *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #28, pts. 1-2, Z, II, #26, an important landholder of Volynia, Orthodox.
- Zbarazhsky, Simeon Vasilevich, prince, namestnik of Kremenets, 1475-80(?), *AluZ*, VIII (Book 4), #8 (the date of this document is uncertain), an important landholder of Volynia, Orthodox.
- Zen'ko Evlashkovich, pan, tivun of Volozhin, koniushii of Novgorod, 1482, LM, IV, #68, gorodnichii and kliuchnik of Novgorod, 1488-93, namestnik of Toropets, 1492-98, LM, IV, 121, III, #16, SRIO, XXXV, 63, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #10.
- Zenov'evich, Iuri Iur'evich, pan, namestnik of Braslavl', 1495-98, PSRL, XVII, 553, LM, V, #75, 180, namestnik of Smolensk, 1508, DZ, #109, namestnik of Mogilev, 1514, Z, II, #86, DZ, #137, descendant of a supporter of Vitovt, at the *seim* of 1401, Zenovii Bartoshevich, Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim*, pp. 30, 351, but made a grant to the Kievo-Pechersky monastery, Z, I, #88, so Orthodox.
- Zhdan, tivun of Troki, 1494-1504, LM, V, #70, ALM, I, #128, #140, 687, dead by 1506, ALM, I, #756.
- Zheslavsky, Bogdan Ivanovich, prince, namestnik of Minsk, 1499-1514, Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie*, #11, Z, II, #10, 76, Orthodox, see Mikhail Ivanovich Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky below, brother-in-law of Mikhail Glinsky.
- Zheslavsky, Feodor Ivanovich, prince, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1492, SRIO, XXXV, 67, namestnik of Briansk, 1494-99, LM, V, #45, 123-34, DZ, #51, LM, V, #177, 179, 192-93, 216, namestnik of Ros', 1502-14 and until his death, 1539, Z, I, #206, II, #10, 45, 76, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 591, namestnik of Obolitsa, 1502-08. Both of these posts may have been given to Feodor in compensation for his loss of Briansk. Orthodox, see Mikhail below, brother-in-law of Mikhail Glinsky.
- Zheslavsky, Ivan Iur'evich, prince, namestnik of Minsk, 1457-83, ALM, I, #15, LM, III, #1, pt. 20, *IuZ*, I, #31, Orthodox, father of Mikhail, Feodor and Bogdan.
- Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, prince, namestnik of Vitebsk, 1492-95, LM, V, #29, 43, 79, Wolff, *Kniazowie*, p. 265, great-great grandson of Evnutei Gedeminovich, brother-in-law of Mikhail Glinsky. From the fact that he and his wife gave land to an Orthodox monastery, we may conclude that he was Orthodox.

WORKS CONSULTED

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AI</i>	<i>Akty istoricheskie</i> (5 vols. plus index, St. Petersburg 1841-1842).
<i>AE</i>	<i>Akty sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi Imperii arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsii</i> (4 vols., St. Petersburg 1836).
<i>AluZ</i>	<i>Arkhiv Iugozapadnoi Rossii</i> (8 series in 35 books in 37 vols., Kiev 1859-1914).
<i>ALM</i>	Leontovich, F.I., ed., <i>Akty litovskoi metriki</i> (2 vols., Warsaw 1896-1897).
<i>AUPL</i>	Kutrzeba, S. and W. Semkowicz, eds., <i>Atka Unji Polski z Litwa</i> (Cracow 1932).
Avizonis, <i>Die Entstehung</i>	Avizonis, K., <i>Die Entstehung und Entwicklung des litauischen Adels bis zur litauisch-polnischen Union 1385</i> (Berlin 1932).
<i>AW</i>	<i>Ateneum Wileńskie</i> (14 vols., Vilna 1923-1939).
Bantysh-Kamensky	<i>Obzor vneshnikh snoshenii Rossii</i> (5 pts., Moscow 1894-1900).
Chodynicky, <i>Kościół prawosławny</i>	Chodynicky, K., <i>Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpolita Polska</i> (Warsaw 1934).
<i>Codex Diplomaticus</i>	Dogiel, M., <i>Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae</i> (3 vols., Vilna 1758-1764).
Cyprian	Cyprian, metropolitan of Kiev, <i>Kniga stepannaia tsarskago rodosloviia, soderzhashchaia istoriiu rossiiskuiu s nachala onyia do vremen gosudaria tsaria i velikago kniazia ioanna Vasil'evicha, sochinennaia trudami preosviashchennykh mitro-politov Kiprianna i Makarii, a napechatannaia pod smotreniem . . . Gerarda Friderika Millera . . .</i> (Moscow 1775).
<i>DA</i>	<i>Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim</i> (12 vols., plus index to 1-10, St. Petersburg 1848-1875).
<i>DZ</i>	Dovnar-Zapol'skii, M. V., ed., "Akty Litovsko-Russkago gosudarstva 1390-1529," <i>Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh</i> (Moscow 1899), vol. 191.
Golubinsky, <i>Istoriia</i>	Golubinsky, E., <i>Istoriia russkoi tserkvi</i> (2 vols. in 4 pts., Moscow 1880-1917).
Halecki, <i>Dzieje unji</i>	Halecki, O., <i>Dzieje unji Jagiellońskiej</i> (2 vols., Cracow 1919-1920).
<i>Halecki, Ostatnie lata</i>	Halecki, O., <i>Ostatnie lata Swidrygielły i sprawa Wolyńska</i> (Cracow 1915).
Hrushevsky, <i>Istoriia</i>	Hrushevsky, M., <i>Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusi</i> (9 vols., Kiev-Lvov 1898-1928).
<i>IA</i>	<i>Istoricheskii Arkhiv</i> (10 vols., Moscow-Leningrad 1936-1954).
<i>IuZ</i>	<i>Akty otnosiashchiesia k istorii iuzhnoi i zapadnoi Rossii</i> (15 vols., St. Petersburg 1862-1892).
Kamieniecki, <i>Spoleczenstwo</i>	Kamieniecki, W., <i>Spoleczenstwo litewski w XV wieku</i> (Warsaw 1947).
<i>KD</i>	Fijałek, J., and W. Semkowicz, <i>Kodeks dyplomatyczny Katedry i dyecezje wileńskiej</i> (Cracow 1948), I.
<i>KKL</i>	<i>Sbornik letopisei otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii (Kratkaia Kievskaiia letopis')</i> (Kiev 1888).
Krasauskaite, <i>Die Adelsprivilegien</i>	Krasauskaite, M., <i>Die litauschen Adelsprivilegien bis zum Ende des XV Jahrhunderts</i> (Borna-Leipzig 1927).
Kuczynski, <i>Ziemie</i>	Kuczyński, S. M., <i>Ziemie czernihowsko-siewierskie pod rządami Litwy</i> (Warsaw 1936).
de Lannoy, <i>Oeuvres</i>	de Lannoy, G., <i>Oeuvres</i> (Louvain 1878).

WORKS CONSULTED

- LM Russia. Arkheograficheskaia Kommissiia, ed., *Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka*, "Litovskaia Metrika" (St. Petersburg 1910), XX, XXVII. (LM represents *Kniga pervaiia zapisei*, LM, II, *Kniga vtoraiia zapisei*, etc.)
- Liubavsky, *Litovsko-russkii seim* Liubavsky, M. K., "Litovsko-russkii seim," *OIDR* (Moscow 1900-1901), in vols. 195, 197, 199.
- Liubavsky, *Oblastnoe delenie* ———, *Oblastnoe delenie i mestnoe upravlenie Litovsko-Russago Gosudarstva* (Moscow 1893).
- Liubavsky, *Ocherk* ———, *Ocherk istorii Litovsko-Russkago Gosudarstva do Liublinskoi unii vkluchitel'no* (Moscow 1910).
- Makarii, *Istoriia* Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi, period razdeleniia russkoi tserkvi na dve mitropolii*, (Book IV, *Istoriia zapadno-russkoi ili litovskoi mitropolii*) (St. Petersburg 1879), IX.
- MHP *Monumenta medii aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia* (19 vols., Cracow 1874-1927).
- NL *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov* (Moscow-Leningrad 1950).
- ODB *Opisanie dokumentov i bumag khraniashchikhsia v Moskovskom arkhive ministerstva iustitsii* (21 vols., Moscow 1869-1921).
- OIDR *Obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, Chteniia* (264 vols., Moscow 1843-1918).
- Papee, *Polska i Litwa* Papée, F., *Polska i Litwa na Przełomie wieków Srednich* (3 vols., Cracow 1904-1947).
- PMRP Bantysh-Kamensky, N. N., "Perepiska mezhdu Rossieiu i Pol'sheiu po 1700 god," *Chteniia v obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (St. Petersburg 1860), IV.
- PSRL *Polnoe Sobranie russkikh letopisei* (25 vols., St. Petersburg 1842-1849).
- RIB *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka* (37 vols., St. Petersburg 1874-1808).
- RK Miliukov, P. N., ed., "Drevneishaia Razriadnaia kniga offitsial'noi redaktsii po 1565 g.," *OIDR* (Moscow 1902), in vols. 200-201.
- RO Joachim, E. and W. Hubatsch, *Regesta historico-diplomatica Ordinis S. Mariae Theutonicorum 1198-1525* (2 vols. in 4, Göttingen 1948-1950).
- SD *Arkheograficheskii sbornik dokumentov otnosiashchikhsia k istorii severo-zapadnoi Rusi* (14 vols., Vilna 1867-1904).
- SDGAG *Sobranie drevnikh gramot i aktov gorodov: Vil'ny, Kovna, Trok, pravoslavnykh monastyrei, tserkvei i po raznym predmetam* (15 vols., Vilna 1843-).
- SGGD *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov* (5 vols., Moscow 1813-1894).
- SHRM Turgenev, A. I., ed., *Supplementum ad Historica Russiae Monumenta* (St. Petersburg 1848).
- SNM *Spiski naselionnykh mest Rossiiskoi imperii po svedeniam 1859 goda* (40 vols. in 39, St. Petersburg 1861-1885).
- SPS *Sbornik paleograficheskikh snimkov s drevnikh gramot i aktov khraniashchikhsia v Vilenskoi Tsentral'nom arkhive i Vilenskoi Publichnoi Biblioteke* (Vilna 1844), pt. I.
- SRIO *Sbornik russkago imperatorskago istoricheskago obshchestva* (149 vols., St. Petersburg 1867-1916).
- SRP *Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum* (5 vols., Leipzig 1861-1874).
- TL Prisel'kov, M. D., ed., *Troitskaia letopis' (reconstruction)* (Moscow and Leningrad 1950).
- U Serbina, K. N., ed., *Ustiuzhskii letopisnyi svod* (Moscow-Leningrad 1950).
- VK *Atky izdavaemye Arkheograficheskoi kommissii vilenskoiu Kommissieiu dlia razbora drevnykh aktov* (39 vols., Vilna 1865-1915).

WORKS CONSULTED

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Vladimirsky-Budanov, <i>Istoriia</i> | Vladimirsky-Budanov, M. F., <i>Kristomatiia po istorii Russkago prava</i> (3 vols., Iaroslavl' 1871-1876). |
| Vladimirsky-Budanov, <i>Obzor</i> | ———, <i>Obzor istorii russkago prava</i> (7th ed., Kiev-Petrograd 1915). |
| VM | Theiner, A., <i>Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum ex tabularis Vaticanis</i> (4 vols., Rome 1860-1864). |
| Z | <i>Atky otnosiashchiesia k istorii zapadnoi Rossii</i> (5 vols., St. Petersburg 1846-1853). |
| ZA | <i>Zakondatel'nye Atky velikogo kniazhestva litovskogo XV-XVI vv.</i> (Leningrad 1936). |
| ZhMNP | <i>Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia</i> (362 vols., St. Petersburg 1834-1905, 72 nrs., St. Petersburg 1906-1917). |
| ZPL | Działiński, T., ed., <i>Zbiór Praw Litewskich od roku 1389 do roku 1528</i> (Poznan 1841). |

SOURCES

- Acta historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia 1507-1795* (13 vols., Cracow 1878-1908).
Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z archivum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie (22 vols., Lvov 1868-1914).
Akty istoricheskie (5 vols. plus index, St. Petersburg 1841-1842); *Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim* (12 vols. plus index to 1-10, St. Petersburg 1848-1875).
Akty iuridicheskie, ili sobranie form strannago deloproizvodstva (St. Petersburg 1838, Index, St. Petersburg 1840).
Akty izdavaemye Arkheograficheskoi kommissii vilenskoiu kommissieiu dlia razbora drevnykh aktov (39 vols., Vilna 1865-1915).
Akty Moskovskago gosudarstva (3 vols., St. Petersburg 1890-1901).
Akty otnosiashchiesia do iuridicheskago byta drevnei Rossii (3 vols., St. Petersburg 1857-1884, Index, St. Petersburg 1901).
Akty otnosiashchiesia k istorii iuzhnoi i zapadnoi Rossii (15 vols., St. Petersburg 1862-1892).
Akty otnosiashchiesia k istorii zapadnoi Rossii (5 vols., St. Petersburg 1846-1853).
Akty sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi Imperii arkheograficheskoiu ekspeditsieiu (4 vols., St. Petersburg 1836).
Arkheograficheskii sbornik dokumentov otnosiashchikhsia k istorii severo-zapadnoi Rusi (14 vols., Vilna 1867-1904).
Arkhir iugozapadnoi Rossii (8 series in 35 books in 37 vols., Kiev 1859-1914).
Bantysh-Kamensky, N.N., "Perepiska mezhdu Rossieiu i Pol'sheiu po 1700 god," *Chtenniia v obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (St. Petersburg 1860), IV.
———, *Obzor vneshnikh snoshenii Rossii* (5 pts., Moscow 1894-1900).
Barwinski, B., Kilka dokumentow i zamitok do czasiw wel. kniagiw Swytryhajla i Zygygota Kejstutowyega," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Schevchenka*, LXV, 522.
Boiarskaia kniga 1556 goda, vol. III of *Arkiv istoriko-iuridicheskikh svedenii otnosiashchikhsia do Rossii* (Moscow 1861).
Daniłowicz, I., ed., *Skarbiec diplomatów Litwy, Rusi Litewskiej* (2 vols., Vilna 1860-1862).
Dogiel, M., *Codex diplomaticus Regni Poloniae et Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae* (5 vols., Vilna 1758-1764).
Dokumenty otnosiashchiesia k istorii zapadno-russkogo kraia i ego otnosheniia k Rossii i Pol'she (St. Petersburg 1865).
Dovnar-Zapol'skii, M. V., ed., "Atky Litovsko-Russkago gosudarstva 1390-1529," *OIDR*, vol. 191.
Działyński, T., ed., *Zbiór Praw Litewskich od roku 1389 do roku 1528* (Posnan 1841).
Fedotov Chekhovskii, A., ed., *Akty otnosiaschiesia do grazhdanskoi raspravy drevnei Rossii* (2 vols., Kiev 1860-1863).
Fijałek, J., and W. Semkowicz, eds., *Kodeks dyplomatyczny katedry i dyecezje wileńskiej* (Cracow 1948), I.
Hrushevsky, Mikhail, ed., "Materialy dlia istorii mestnago upravleniia v sviazi s istorieiu soslovnoi organizatsii," *AluZ* (Kiev 1893-1894), series VIII, Books 1-2.
Iasinskii, Mikhail Nikitich, *Ustavnyiia zemskiiia gramoty litovsko-russkago gosudarstva* (Kiev 1889).
Istoricheskii Arkhir (10 vols., Moscow-Leningrad 1936-1954).
Joachim, E., and W. Hubatsch, *Regesta historico-diplomatica Ordinis S. Mariae Theutonicorum 1198-1525* (2 vols. in 4, Göttingen 1948-1950).
Kutrzeba, S., *Polskie ustawy i artykuły wojskow og XV do XVIII wieku* (Cracow 1937).
——— and W. Semkowicz, eds., *Akta Unji Polski z Litwa* (Cracow 1932).
Leontovich, F. I., ed., *Akty litovskoi metriki* (2 vols., Warsaw 1896-1897).
Miliukov, P. N., ed., "Drevneishaia Razriadnaia kniga offtsial'noi redaktsii po 1565 g.," *ODIR* (Moscow 1902), in vols. 200-201.
Monumenta medii aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia (19 vols., Cracow 1874-1927).
Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana (6 vols., Cracow 1913-1938).
Mukhanov, P., *Sbornik Mukhanova* (1st ed., Moscow 1856).
Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis' starshego i mladshhego izvodov (Moscow-Leningrad 1950).
Novgorodskaia pistsoviia kniga (6 vols. plus index, St. Petersburg 1859-1915).

WORKS CONSULTED

- Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (25 vols., St. Petersburg 1842-1949).
- Prisel'kov, M. D., ed., *Troitskaia letopis'* (reconstruction) (Moscow and Leningrad 1950).
- Pułaski, K., *Stosunki z Medli-Girejam chanem perekopskich tatarów 1496-1515, akta i listy* (Warsaw 1881).
- Raczyński, E., ed., *Codex diplomaticus Lithuaniae* (Breslau 1845).
- Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka* (37 vols., St. Petersburg 1874-1929).
- Sbornik letopisei otnosiashchikhsia k istorii Iushnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii* (Kiev 1888).
- Sbornik paleograficheskikh snimkov s drevnikh gramot i aktov khraniashchikhsia v Vilenskom Tsentral' nom arkhive i Vilenskoj Publichnoj Biblioteke* (Vilna 1884), pt. I.
- Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum* (5 vols., Leipzig 1861-1874).
- Semkowicz, W., "Przywileje Witołda dla Moniwida starosty wileńskiego," *AW*, I, 253-267.
- Serbina, K. N., ed., *Ustiuzhskii letopisnyi svod* (Moscow-Leningrad 1950).
- Sobranie drevnikh gramot i aktov gorodov: Vil'ny, Kovna, Trok, pravoslavnykh monastyrei, tserkvei i po raznym predmetam* (15 vols., Vilna 1843-).
- Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov* (5 vols., Moscow 1813-1894).
- Theiner, A., *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum ex tabularis Vaticanis* (4 vols., Rome 1860-1864).
- Theiner, A., and F. Miklosich, eds., *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem ecclesiarum Graecae et Romanae* (Vienna 1872).
- Töppen, Max., ed., F. Neumann, translator, "Die älteste litauische Chronik," *Altepreussische Monatsschrift*, XIV, 419-458.
- Turgenev, A. I., ed., *Historica Russiae Monumenta* (2 vols., St. Petersburg 1841-1842).
- , ed., *Supplementum ad Historica Russiae Monumenta* (St. Petersburg 1848).
- Voight, J., *Codex diplomaticus prussicus. Urkundensammlung zur älteren Geschichte Preussens aus dem kgl. Geheimen Archive zu Königsberg* (6 vols., Königsberg 1836-1861).
- Zakondatel'nye Akty velikogo kniazhestva litovskogo XV-XVI vv.* (Leningrad 1936).

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Finkel, L., *Bibliografja Historji Polskiej* (3 vols., Lvov 1931-1937).
 Ikonnikov, V., *Opyt russkoi istoriografii* (2 vols. in 4, Kiev 1891-1908).
 Mezhev, V., *Russkaia Istoricheskaia Bibliografiia za 1865-1876 vkluchitel'no* (8 vols., St. Petersburg 1882-1890).
Opisanie dokumentov i bumag khraniashchikhsia v Moskovskom arkhive ministerstva iustitsii (21 vols., Moscow 1869-1921).

SECONDARY ACCOUNTS

- Andriiashev, O., *Ocherk istorii Volynskoi zemli* (Kiev 1889).
 Antonovich, V. B., *Ocherk istorii Velikago Kniazhestva Litovskago do poloviny XV stoletia* (Kiev 1878).
 Arkhangel'ski, P. G., *Ocherki po istorii zemel'nogo stroia Rossii* (Kazan 1920).
 Avizonis, K., *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung des litauischen Adels bis zur litauisch-polnischen Union 1385* (Berlin 1932).
 Bächtold, R., *Südwestrussland im Spätmittelalter* (Basel 1951).
 Balzer, O. M., "Istota prawna zależności Książąt litewsko-ruskich w dobie 1386-1398/1401," *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie* (Lvov 1922), I, 196-204.
 ———, "Nowsze poglądy na istotę prawno-panstwowego stosunku Polski i Litwy w Jagiełłońskim średniowieczu," *Sprawozdania Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie* (Lvov 1921), II, 89.
 Baumgarten, N., "Polotzk et la Lithuanie" une page l'histoire, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* (Rome 1936), II, nrs. I-II.
 Bazilevich, K. V., *Vneshniaia Politika Russkogo Tsentralizovannogo Gosudarstva: vtoraiia polovina XV* (Moscow 1950).
 Berezhkov, N., *Litovskaia Metrika kak istoricheskii istochnik* (Moscow-Leningrad 1946).
 Bernhard, B., "Johannes Falkenberg O. P. und der preussischpolnische Streit vor dem Konstanzer Konzil" (mit archivalischen Beilagen), *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Gotha 1896), XVI, 385-464.
 Bobrzyński, M., ed., *Rerum Publicarum Scientiae quae saeculo XV in Polonia viguit monumenta litteraria* (Cracow 1878).
 Boldt, F., "Der Deutsche Orden und Littauen 1370-1386," *Altpreussische Monatsschrift* (Königsberg 1873), X, pts. 5 & 6.
 Buczynskyj, B., "Kilka przyczynkiw do czasiw wel. knazia Swytryhajla (1430-1433)," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarstva im. Shevchenka*, LXXVI, 117-142.
 ———, "Studii z istorii cerkovnoi unii," *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarstva im. Shevchenka*, LXXXV, LXXXVI, LXXXVIII.
 Cherepnin, L. V., *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy XIV-XV vekov* (2 vols., Moscow 1948-1951).
 Chodyncki, K., *Kościół prawnoślawny a Rzeczpolita Polska* (Warsaw 1934).
 Cyprian, metropolitan of Kiev, *Kniga stepennaia tsarskago rodosloviia, soderzhashchaia istoriiu rossiiskuiu s nachala onyia do vremen gosudaria tsaria i velikago kniazia Ioanna Vasil'evicha, sochinennaia trudami preosviashchennykh mitropolitov Kiprianna i Makarii, a napechatannaia pod smortreniem . . . Gerarda Friderika Millera . . .* (Moscow 1775).
 Danilevich, V. E., *Ocherk istorii Polotskoi zemli do kontsa XIV stoletia* (Kiev 1896).
 Dashkevich, N. P., "Bor'ba kul'tur i narodnostei v litovsko-russkom gosudarstve v period dinasticheskoi unii Litvy s Pol'sheiu," *Universitetskiiia Izvestiia* (Kiev 1884), XXIV, pt. 10, 269-316; pt. 12, 317-330.
 Długosz, J., *Opera Omnia* (14 vols., Cracow 1863-1887).
 Dovnar-Zapol'skii, M. V., *Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo v kniazhestve litovskom pri Iagellonakh* (Kiev 1901), I.
 Efimenko, A. I., "Litovsko-russkie danniki i ikh dani," *ZhMNP*, CCCXXXV, 106-19.
 Ekzempiarsky, A. V., *Velikie i udel'nye Kniaz'ia severnoi Rusi v tatarskii period s 1238-1505* (2 vols., St. Petersburg 1889-1891).
 El'iashevich, V. B., *Istoriia prava pozemel'noi sobstvennosti v Rossii* (2 vols., Paris 1948-1951).
 Fidler, J., "Die Allianz zwischen Kaiser Maximilian I und Wasilij Ivanovitsch, Grossfürst v.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Russland. von dem Jahre 1514," *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophischen-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna 1860), XL, 27-123.
- Fijałek, J., "Biskupstwa grecki na ziemiach ruskich od połowy wieku XIV," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Lvov 1897), XI, 1-63.
- , "Los unii florenckiej w wielkim Księstwie Litewskim za Kazimierza Jawiełłończyka," *Bulletin international de l'Academie polonaise des sciences et des lettres* (classe de philologie, classe d'histoire et de philosophie) (Cracow 1934), nrs. 1-3.
- Filevich, I. P., *Bor'ba Pol'shi i Litvy-Rusi za Galitsko-Vladimirskoe nasledie* (St. Petersburg 1890).
- Finkel, L., "List Michała Głinskiego o bitwie pod Kleckiem w a. 1506," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Lvov 1915), XXIX, 296-299.
- Fleischhacker, H., *Die staats- und völkerrechtlichen Grundlagen der moskovitischen Aussenpolitik* (14-17. Jahrhundert) (Breslau 1938), *Beiheft 1: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*.
- Golubinsky, E., *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* (2 vol. in 4 pts., Moscow 1880-1917).
- Golubovsky, P. V., *Istoriia Smolenskoi zemli do nachala XV st.* (Kiev 1895).
- Grekov, B. D., L. V. Cherepnin, and V. T. Pashuto, eds., *Ocherki istorii SSSR—Period Feodalizma IX-XV vv* (2 vols., Moscow 1953).
- , and A. Iu. Iakubovsky, *Zolotaia Orda i ee Padenie* (2nd ed., Moscow 1950).
- Halecki, O., *Dzieje unji Jagiełłońskiej* (2 vols., Cracow 1919-1920).
- , "Geografia polityczna ziem ruskich i Litwy 1340-1569," *Spawozdania towarzystwa naukowego Warszawskiego* (Warsaw 1917), nrs. 1-2.
- , "Imperialism in Slavic and East European History," *The American Slavic and East European Review*, XI, 1-26.
- , *Le problème de l'Union des Eglises, Extrait de la Pologne au VI-e Congress International des Sciences Historiques, Oslo 1928* (Warsaw 1930).
- , "Litwa, Ruś i Żmudź jako części składowe w. księstwa litewskiego," *Rozprawy Akademii umiejętności, Wydział historyczno-filozoficzny LIX*, 214-254.
- , *Ostatnie lata Swidrygely i sprawa Wolyńska* (Cracow 1915).
- , "Przyczynki genealogiczne do dziejów ukł'adu krewskiego," *Miesięcznik heraldyczny* (1935).
- Hrushevsky, M., *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusi* (9 vols., Kiev-Lvov 1898-1928).
- Iakubovskii, I. V., "Zemskie privilei velikago kniazhestva litovskago," *ZhMNP*, CCCXXXVI, 240-78.
- Istoricheskie zapiski* (50 vols.+, Moscow 1937-).
- Ivanov, *Sistematicheskoe obozrenie pomestnykh prav i obiazannostei v Rossii* (Moscow 1836).
- Jabłonowski, A., *Historya Rusi Południowej do upadku Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* (Cracow 1912).
- Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (6 vols., Breslau 1936-1943).
- Kamieniecki, W., *Spółeczeństwo litewski w XV wieku* (Warsaw 1947).
- Karamzin, N. M., *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago* (5th ed., 12 vols. in 3, St. Petersburg 1842).
- Karpov, G., *Istoriia bor'by moskovskogo gosudarstva s pol'sko-litovskim 1462-1506* (Moscow, 1867).
- Kliuchevsky, V. O., *Boiarskaia Duma Drevnei Rusi* (5th ed., Petrograd 1919).
- , *Istoriia soslovii v Rossii* (3rd ed., Petrograd 1918).
- , *Kurs russkoi istorii* (5 vols., Moscow 1937, reproduced Ann Arbor 1948).
- Kolankowski, L., *Dzieje Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego za Jagiełłońow*, I: 1377-1499 (Warsaw 1930).
- Koneczny, F., "Geneza urozczeń Iwana III. do Rusi Litewskiej," *AW*, III, 193-264.
- , "Litwa a Moskwa w latach 1449-1492," *Rozprawy Wydział III Towarstwa Przyj. Nauk w Wilnie* (Vilna 1929), II.
- Krakowski, S., "Korjatowicze i sprawa podolska w XIV w. w oświeceniu najnowszej historiografii polskiej," *AW*, XIII, 250-274.
- Krasauskaite, M., *Die litauschen Adelsprivilegien bis zum Ende des XV. Jahrhunderts* (Borna-Leipzig 1927).
- Krasinski, V., *Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland* (2 vols., London 1838-1840).
- Kuczyński, S. M., *Ziemia czernihowsko-siewierskie pod rządami Litwy* (Warsaw 1936).
- Kutrzeba, S., *Historia ustroju Polski w zarysie* (8th ed. revised and supplemented by Adam Vetulani, Warsaw 1949).

WORKS CONSULTED

- de Lannoy, G., *Oeuvres* (Louvain 1878).
- Lappo, I. I., "Litovsko-russkoe gosudarstvo v sostave Rechi Pospolitom," *Vědecké práce Ruské Lidové University v. Praze* (Prague 1929), II, 63-76.
- Lelewel, J., *Histoire de Pologne* (2 vols., Paris-Lille 1844).
- Lewicki, A., "Powstanie Swidrigiełły" *Rozprawy Akademii umiejętności, Wydział historyczno-filozoficzny* (Cracow 1892), Series II, IV, 128-516.
- , "Unii Florencka w Polsce," *ibid.* (Cracow 1899), Series II, XIII, 205-274.
- Liubavskii, M. K., "Litovsko-Russkii Seim," *OIDR* (Moscow 1900-1901) in vols. 195, 197, 199.
- , "Novye trudy po istorii litovsko-russkago seima," *ZhMNP*, CCCXXXV, 379-393.
- , *Oblastnoe delenie i mestnoe upravlenie Litovsko-Russkago Gosudarstva* (Moscow 1893).
- , *Ocherk istorii Litovsko-Russkago Gosudarstva do Liublinskoi unii vkluchitel'no* (Moscow 1910).
- Major, R. H., translator and ed., *Notes upon Russia . . . by the Baron Sigismund von Herberstein* (2 vols., London 1851-1852).
- Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi, period razdeleniia russkoi tserkvi na dve mitropolii* (Book IV, *Istoriia zapadno-russkoi ili litovskoi mitropolii*) (St. Petersburg 1879), IX.
- Maksimeiko, N. A., *Seimy Litovsko-Russkogo gosudarstva do Liublinskoi unii 1569 g.* (Khar'kov 1902).
- Malinovskii, I., *Rada Velikago Kniazhestva Litovskago v sviazi s boiarskoi dumoi drevnei Rossii* (2 vols., Tomsk 1912).
- Mortensen, H. V., "Neues zur Frage der mittelalterlichen Nordgrenze der Litauer," *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* (Leipzig 1933), X, 273-305, with map.
- Nasonov, A. N., *Russkaia zemlia i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva* (Moscow 1951).
- Natanson-Leski, J., "Dzieje Granicy wschodniej Rzeczypospolitej. Część I Granica Moskiewska w epoce Jagiellońskiej," *Rozprawy historyczne towarzystwa naukowego Warszawskiego* (Lwów-Warsaw 1922), I, zeszyt 3.
- Nevolin, K. A., *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (6 vols., St. Petersburg 1857).
- Obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, *Chteniia* (264 vols., Moscow 1843-1918).
- Papée, F., *Polska i Litwa na Przelomie Wieków Srednich* (Cracow 1904) I.
- , *Aleksandr Jagiellończyk* (Cracow 1949).
- Paszkiewicz, H., *Jagiellonowie a Moskwa* (Warsaw 1933), I.
- Pfitzner, J., *Grössfurst Witold von Litauen als Staatsmann*, No. 6, *Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Deutschen Universität in Prag* (Brünn 1930).
- Pierling, P., *La Russie et le Saint-Siège* (3 vols., Paris 1896).
- Pogodin, M. P., *Drevniia russkaia istoriia do mongol'skago iga* (3 vols., Moscow 1871).
- , *O proiskhozhdenii Rusi* (Moscow 1825).
- Presniakov, A. E., *Obrazovanie Velikorusskogo gosudarstva* (Petrograd 1918).
- Prochaska, A., *Dzieje Witolda w. Księcia Litwy* (Vilna 1914).
- , *Król Władysław Jagiełło* (2 vols., Cracow 1908).
- Puzyna, J., "Korjat i Korjatowicze," *AW*, VII, 425-454.
- , "Korjat i Korjatowicze oraz sprawa Podolska," *AW*, XI, 61-97.
- , "O pochodzeniu Kniazia Fedka Nieświeskiego," *Miesięcznik heraldyczny* IV, 6-15, 43-47, 74-82.
- , "Pierwsze wystąpienie Korjatowiczów na Rusi południowej," *AW*, XIII, 1-68.
- Rutkowski, J., *Histoire économique de Pologne avant les partages* (Paris 1927).
- Saviolov-Saviolkov, L., *Russkoe drevnee dvorianstvo* (Athens 1936).
- Sbornik russkago imperatorskago istoricheskago obshchestva* (149 vols., St. Petersburg 1867-1916).
- Semenov, P., *Geograficheskoi-staticheskii slovar' rossiiskoi imperii* (5 vols., St. Petersburg 1863-1885).
- Semkowicz, W., "O litewskich rodach bojarskich zbratanych ze szlachtą polską w Horodle 1413," *Miesięcznik heraldyczny*, 1913, IX-XII; 1914, I-VI.
- , "W sprawie początków szlachty na Litwie i jej ustroju rodowego," *Kwartalnik historyczny* (Lvov 1915), XXIX.
- Seraphim, A., "Preussische Urkunden in Russland," *Altpreussische Monatschrift* (1907), XLIV, 65-87.
- Sergeevich, V. I., *Russkii iuridicheskii Drevnosti* (3 vols., St. Petersburg 1900-1903).
- Soloviov, S. M., *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen* (29 vols. in 6 plus index, St. Petersburg 1897).

WORKS CONSULTED

- . "Obzor diplomaticeskikh snoshenii Moskovskago dvora s Litovskim vo vtoroi polovine XV veka," *ZhMNP* (St. Petersburg 1854), LXXXII, pt. 2, 43-78.
- Spiski naselionnykh mest Rossiiskoi imperii po svedeniiam 1859 goda* (40 vols. in 39, St. Petersburg 1861-1885).
- Spuler, B., *Die Goldene Horde* (Leipzig 1943).
- Stählin, K., *Geschichte Russlands* (Berlin-Leipzig 1913), I.
- Tatishchev, V. N., *Istoriia Rossiskaia S Samikh Drevneishikh Vremen* (5 vols., Moscow 1768-1848).
- Turdeanu, E., "Grégoire Camblak," *Revue des Études Slaves*, XXII, 46-81.
- Ulianitskii, V. A., "O polozhenii russkikh verkhovskikh kniazei i v chastnosti kniazei Mosalskikh v Litovskom gosudarstve v XV v." *OIDR* (1895), vol. 172, 3-6.
- Valois, N., *Le pape et le concile 1418-50* (2 vols., Paris 1909).
- Vernadsky, G., *The Mongols and Russia* (New Haven 1953).
- , *Opyt istorii Evrazii s poloviny VI veka do nastoiashchego vremeni* (Berlin 1934).
- Veselovsky, S. B., *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie v severo-vostochnoi Rusi* (Moscow-Leningrad 1947), I.
- Vladimirsky-Budanov, M. F., *Kristomatiia po istorii Russkago prava* (3 vols., Iaroslavl' 1871-1876).
- , *Naselenie Iugozapadnoi Rossii ot poloviny XIII do poloviny XVII st.* (Kiev 1886).
- , *Obzor istorii russkago prava* (7th ed., Kiev-St. Petersburg 1915).
- Voigt, J., *Geschichte Preussens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Untergange der Herrschaft des Deutschen Ordens* (9 vols., Königsberg 1827-1839).
- Völker, K., *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin-Leipzig 1930).
- Wolff, J., *Kniazowie litewsko-ruscy od końca XIV wieku* (Warsaw 1895).
- Wojeiechowski, Z., *L'état Polonais au moyen âge* (Paris 1949).
- Zajaczkowski, S., "Die Geschichte Litauens bis 1386 in der polnischen Geschichtsschreibung der letzten 20 Jahre," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (Breslau 1939), IV, 136-148.
- Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia* (362 vols., St. Petersburg 1834-1905, 72 nrs., St. Petersburg 1906-1917).
- Ziegler, A., *Die Union des Konzils von Florenz in der russischen Kirche* (Würzburg 1938).

GLOSSARY

<i>armiger</i>	weapons-bearer
<i>barones</i>	pans, a group of nobles of higher rank who emerged from mass of boyars
<i>boiarin</i>	a lesser boyar in eastern Lithuanian areas, such as Kiev and Smolensk toward the end of the fifteenth century
<i>capitaneus</i>	Latin term for <i>starosta</i>
<i>castellanus</i>	Latin term for <i>pan</i>
<i>chastnichestvo</i>	possibly an alternative term for the post of <i>kliuchnik</i>
<i>cheliad'(i)</i>	servant
<i>dannichii(e)</i>	tribute collector
<i>dannik(i)</i>	tribute payer, vassal
<i>derzhavtsa(y)</i>	a prefect (late fifteenth and early sixteenth century substitute for <i>namestnik</i>)
<i>diakło(a)</i>	alternative spelling of <i>dziakło</i>
<i>del'chii(e)</i>	collector of honey
<i>dogovornaia gramota</i>	a treaty
<i>dokõnchal'naia gramota</i>	a quasi-treaty which established a mixed ally-vassal relationship
<i>dvorianin</i>	a lesser boyar in western Lithuania
<i>dziakło(a)</i>	tribute in kind on all produce
<i>gorodnichii(e)</i>	supervisors of services of citizens and of <i>dzialka</i>
<i>gospodarskii boiarin</i>	a lesser boyar holding crown land and owing services directly to the crown
<i>grosh</i>	a piece of money
<i>houptmann</i>	German term for <i>namestnik</i>
<i>kaznachei</i>	treasurer and collector of fines
<i>khoruzhii</i>	standard-bearer
<i>klepachi</i>	near serfs
<i>kliuchnik(i)</i>	keepers of the keys, controllers of honey deposits
<i>kmetia</i>	unidentified unit of land measure
<i>koniushii</i>	master of the stables
<i>korm</i>	subsistence
<i>lentvoit</i>	land captain
<i>lovchii(e)</i>	tribute-collectors, especially hunting
<i>mezlava</i>	tribute in kind on all livestock
<i>ministeriales</i>	judicial agents of the Lithuanian government who intervened when nobles judged unfairly in their courts
<i>mytnik</i>	collector of tolls and tariffs
<i>namestnik(i)</i>	a prefect, administrator and chief judge of a province or district
<i>okhmistr</i>	housekeeper

GLOSSARY

<i>okol'nichii(e)</i>	lesser courtier, especially in Smolensk, who obliged citizens to perform obligations
<i>okrug(i)</i>	a prefecture, the district of a <i>namestnik</i>
<i>otchina</i>	older form of <i>votchina</i>
<i>palatinus</i>	Latin term for <i>voevoda</i>
<i>pan</i>	a noble of higher rank, or colloquially just a gentleman (see <i>barones</i>)
<i>parobki</i>	overseers of serfs
<i>patrimonium(ia)</i>	<i>votchina</i>
<i>pisar'</i>	scribe
<i>povet(y)</i>	province or district
<i>put'nye liudi</i>	repairers of roads
<i>rada</i>	council
<i>seim</i>	parliament
<i>selishcho</i>	little settlement
<i>serebshchina</i>	tribute in money
<i>slug(i)</i>	a group of people enjoying rights similar to those of boyars, but living as peasants
<i>starosta(y)</i>	an administrator similar to a <i>voevoda</i> , literally an elder
<i>sudebnik</i>	a code of laws
<i>sud'ia</i>	a judge
<i>tiaglo</i>	a <i>dziakło</i>
<i>tiaglyi(oe, ye)</i>	liable to be taxed
<i>tivun(y)</i>	bailiff, a judge with administrative powers
<i>udel'(udeli)</i>	appanage or autonomous principality
<i>udel'nyi(ye)</i>	pertaining to an <i>udel'</i>
<i>vedry</i>	measures of wine
<i>voevoda</i>	governor-general, a military, administrative and judicial official, literally general
<i>voevodich</i>	son of a <i>voevoda</i>
<i>voit</i>	official in charge of a village or township
<i>volost'(i)</i>	township
<i>voskovnichii</i>	official charged with the care of wax
<i>votchina</i>	ancestral estate comprised of allodial land
<i>voznye</i>	writ-servers
<i>zemianin</i>	a boyar in Volynia

INDEX

(This index does not include references to Appendix II, an alphabetical list by name of office-holders and some autonomous and regional princes, or to the Table on pp. 61-78, a list of towns arranged alphabetically within each province or region.)

- Achi-Girei, 52
 Act of Union of 1401, 83-84, 121-22n30
 Afanas Pusushovich, 115n63
 Afanas Terekhovich, 115n63
 Agents of Great princes of Lithuania, 17, 18
 Alexander: and Casimir, 4; land grants, 21, 22, 32, 33, 90-91; Privilege of 1492, 42; land grant of 1494, 44; Samogitian Privilege of 1492, 44; union of Poland and Lithuania, 45; Draft Union of 1501, 45; and nobility, 45, 46, 109; and Moscow, 59; Catholic and Orthodox Church, 83, 88; religious policy of, 90; and desertion, 98; and Mezetskys, 101; and Belevskys, 102; and Ivan III, 104; and centralization, 108; and Starodub, 126n25, 26; and Odeovskys, 129n74
 Alexander, Pope, 89
 Alexander Soltanovich, 123n63
 Alexei, Metropolitan, 83
 Alliance of 1470, 88
 Andrei, Bishop of Lutsk, 122n30
 Andrei Aleksandrovich, 114n61
 Andrei Olgimuntovich, 36
 Andrei Semionovich, 115n63
 Avignon, 79, 80

 Bakino, 100, 127n58
 Bedrikh, 27
 Belev, 101, 102
 Belevsky, Andrei Vasil'evich, 101-02, 126n48, 131n75
 Belevsky, Ivan Vasil'evich, 100, 101, 102, 126n48, 127n57
 Belevsky, Vasilii Vasil'evich, 101-02, 126n48, 127n57, 131n75
 Belevskys, 8, 126-27n48
 Belogolovl', 103
 Bel'sk, 8, 10, 11, 13, 52, 105
 Bel'sky, Dmitri Ivanovich, 132n117
 Bel'sky, Feodor Ivanovich, 86, 98-100, 105, 127n49, 131n86, 132n117
 Bel'sky, Ivan Vladimirovich, 98
 Bel'sky, Semion Ivanovich, 89, 132n110
 Bel'skys, 123n63
 Belyi, 98
 Benedict XIII, Pope, 80
 Bernardine Order, 86
 Black Russia, 7, 112n3
 Black Vikings, 112n3
 Blagoveshchensky Monastery, 30
 Bliudov, Feodor, 129-30n74
 Bobrok-Volynsky, Dmitri Koriatovich, 3, 94
 Bogdan Koreevich, 21, 114n61
 Bogdan Senkovich, 114n61
 Bogdan Volchkovich, 17
 Bogush Bogovitinovich, 55, 114n61

 Bokei, 115n63
 Boniface IX, Pope, 80, 81
 Boriatin, 100, 127n58
 Boriatinsky, Dmitri Aleksandrovich, 100
 Boriatinsky, Feodor Aleksandrovich, 100
 Boriatinsky, Grigorii Aleksandrovich, 100
 Boriatinsky, Lev Aleksandrovich, 100
 Boris Semionovich, 115n63
 Borovsky. *See* Semion Peremvshl'sky
 Borovskys, 112n3
 Braslavl', 53
 Bratslav, 53
 Brest (province), 9, 10, 11, 14, 105
 Brest (town), 14
 Brest-Podliash'e, 14
 Briansk (principality, later district): local government, 11, 57, 59; and Mozhaishkys, 18, 102, 103, 104, 112n10; land grants, 29, 32, 33; and Mikhail Sigismundovich, 52; and Orthodox, 54; and I. I. Nemirovich, 56; and Svidrigailo, 96, 97; and Andrei Kromsky, 105; Muscovite expansion, 106; and Casimir, 116n101; and D. F. Vorotynsky, 128n74
 Briansk (town), 14, 50, 51, 54, 89, 96
 Briansky, Dmitri Olgerdovich, 94-95, 125n7
 Briansky, Roman Mikhailovich, 50, 95
 Bryn, 100
 Budenskoe, 104
 Butoldmintigailo Montygirdovich, 36
 Byelorussia, 111n1
 Byshkovichii, 128n74, 129n74
 Byzantium, 79, 111n4

 Casimir: and religious problems, 4; and land grants, 18, 20, 32, 33, 92; and Privileges, 23, 39, 40, 42, 85, 86; and nobility, 43, 46, 52, 53; and Orthodox Church, 79; and union, 86; and Moscow, 87; religious policy of, 89-90; and desertion, 98; plot against, 99; and A. V. Belevsky, 101-02; and I. A. Mozhaishky, 102, 103; and centralization, 107, 108; and Vasilii II, 112n3; and *diaklo*, 112n8; and Briansk, 112n10, 116n101; and Vorotynskys, 128n74; and Odeovskys, 129n74
 Catholic Church: and desertion, 3-4; rights in land grants, 23; and Privilege of 1387, 34, 35; Pledge of Lithuanian nobility of 1401, 36; Horodlo Union of 1413, 37, 83-84; Privilege of 1447, 40, 41; and Orthodox Church, 79, 82, 83, 85, 89-90, 92, 108-09; policy of, 79; and Eastern Europe, 80-81; and Lithuanian policy, 83, 122n31; and Act of Union of 1401, 83-84; and Casimir, 86; strengthened, 88; and Alexander, 89, 109; rights of, 92-93, 122n48

INDEX

- Catholics, 49, 54-55, 56, 58, 59
 Cherkassy (province), 30, 56, 58, 59
 Cherkassy (town), 55
 Cherkassy, Alexander, 117n111
 Chernigov (principality): local government of, 11, 57; and Orthodox, 54; and Mozhaïskys, 59, 60, 104; and A. A. Droshch, 106; and Muscovite expansion, 106; and Mosal'skys, 130n74
 Chernigov (town), 50, 53, 89
 Chernigov-Seversk: and nobility, 4, 87, 109; composition of, 8; local government, 10, 11, 53-59 *passim*; and land grants, 19, 33; and ownership, 29; and Privilege of 1434, 58; revolt, 59; and desertion, 110
 Chernigovsky, Mikhail, 8
 Chetvertensky, Feodor Feodorovich, 22, 115n63
 Clement V, Pope, 80
 Clement VII, Pope, 80
 Code of 1468, 29, 34, 42
 Colonna, Othone. *See* Martin V
 Constantinople, 83, 85
 Council of Basel, 82, 85
 Council of Constance, 80, 82, 84, 122n40
 Council of Ferrara, 85
 Council of Florence, 82, 85
 Council of Lausanne, 79
 Council of Pisa, 121n3
 Cyprian, Metropolitan, 83, 84, 121n29
 Czartoryski, Alexander Iur'evich, 51
 Czartoryski, Feodor Mikhailovich, 114n46
 Czartoryski, Ivan Iur'evich, 51
 Czartoryski, Mikhail Vasilievich, 20
 Czupurna, Stanislav, 36
- Danilovichi, 103
 Davkha, 36
 Demid, 20-21
 Demon, 99, 128, 129
 Derelishina, 130n74
 Desertion, motives for: interpretations of, 3-5; and religion, 9, 55, 56, 57; and local government, 55, 58; effect of, 57; and Privilege of 1434, 58; periods of, 94; of D. O. Briansky, 94, 95; of Andrei Polotsky, 94; of I. S. Smolensky, 95; of Gedeminovichi, 96; of A. I. Olgimuntovich (Neliub), 96; of Svidrigailo, 96, 97; of P. N. Zvenigorodsky, 96; of A. P. Zvenigorodsky, 96, 97; of Semion Peremyshl'sky, 97; of M. I. Khotetovskiy, 97; of F. I. Bel'sky, 98-100; of S. R. Mezetsky, 100, 101; of A. V. Belevsky, 101, 102; of S. I. Mozhaïsky, 102-105; of Andrei Kromsky, 105; of M. L. Glinsky, 105, 106; of Sen'ko Zherebiatich, 106; of A. A. Droshch, 106; of Iakub Ivashentsovich, 106; of Mezetskys, 130n74; of Vorotynskys, 130n74; of Viazemskys, 130n74; of Mosal'skys, 130, 131n74; of V. I. Shemiachich, 130n74
 Diadovshchina, 101, 128n72
 Dmitri Ivanovich, 94, 100
 Dmitri Olgerdovich, 107, 125n7
 Dobrovka, 127n58
 Donskoi, Dmitri, 94, 132n111
 Donskoi, Vladimir. *See* Vladimir Andreevich
 Dorogobuzh, 129n74
 Dorogobuzhsky, Andrei Dmitrievich, 52
 Dovgird, 36
 Dovkchi, 55
 Dovmont, Kontovtov, 52
 Dovoino Vishigirdovich, 36
 Draft Union of 1501, 34, 45
 Drogichin, 10, 13
 Droshch, Andrei Aleksandrovich, 105, 106
 Drovmutis, 36
 Drutsk, 55
 Drutskys, 11
 Dubrovichi, 103
 Dubrovka, 100
 Dubrovsky court. *See* Dubrovka
 Dziadek, Stanislav, 27
- East European peoples, 2
 Eidikginovichi, 112n8
 Elbing, Kompthur of, 126n30
 Elena, 89, 114n61, 123n79
 Ersh Tereshkovich, 27
 Esko Ivanovich, 21, 115n63
 Eugene IV, Pope, 82, 85
 Eurasia, 111n9
 Evfirmii, 123n55
- Falkenburg, Johannes, 82
 Fedko Golosovich, 115n63
 Fedko Grigorievich, 114n61
 Felix V, Pope, 82, 85
 Feodor Koriatovich, 50
 Feodor Ianushkovich, 115n61
 Feodor L'vovich, 36
 Feodor Pusushovich, 115n63
 Feodor Sviatoslavich, 130n74
 Feodorit, 83
 Ferrara, 82
 Feudalism, 112n1
 First Lithuanian Statute of 1529, 9
 Florentine Union of 1439, 82
 Fominsky, Roman, 130n74
 Fotii, Metropolitan, 84
- Gashov, 36
 Gasztold, 36, 59
 Gedemin, 16, 30, 31, 80
 Gedeminovichi: and Privilege of 1387, 35; and Vitovt, 51, 52, 97; and land grants, 92; and desertion, 94, 96, 98; and Jagailo, 95; and centralization, 107
 Gerasim, Metropolitan, 86, 122n49, 122-23n55
 Germans, 40
 Gineit, 36
 Glazynich, Olekhno Vasil'evich, 26, 115n61
 Glebovich, Iuri, 57, 100, 129n74
 Glebovich, Mikolai Iur'evich, 132n119
 Glebovich, Stanislav, 57

INDEX

- Glinsky, Bogdan Feodorovich, 26, 115n61, 132n119
 Glinsky, Ivan Borisovich, 26, 27, 56, 59, 115n61, 126n42
 Glinsky, Ivan Dashkovich, 115n61
 Glinsky, Ivan L'vovich, 105
 Glinsky, Mikhail L'vovich, 26, 105, 106, 115n62, 132n119, 132n120
 Glinsky, Vasilii L'vovich, 105, 115n62
 Glinskys, 57
 Gnesen, Bishop of L'vov, 84
 Golden Horde, 3, 7, 87
 Golgin, 36
 Goligiud, 36
 Gol'shansky, Ivan Iur'evich, 99
 Gol'shansky, Ivan Olgimuntovich, 51
 Gol'shanskys, 30
 Gomel', 8, 18, 103, 104
 Gornostai Romanovich, 115n61
 Gorodechno, 128, 129
 Gorodets, 10
 Gorodiskaia, 106
 Gorodko, Church of St. John of, 124n91
 Gorodno (prefecture), 10, 14, 88
 Gorodno (town), 7
 Govdyrev, 100, 101
 Govdyrevskys, 101
 Great Schism, 79, 80
 Gregory IX, Pope, 122n34
 Gregory XI, Pope, 81
 Gregory XII, Pope, 80, 121n3
 Grigorii, Bishop of Vladimir, 122n30
 Grigorii, Metropolitan, 86
 Grishko Ivanovich, 114n61
 Gromyko, Grigorii Isaevich, 115n61
 Grünwald, battle of, 3, 87

 Hannush Montygirdovich, 36
 Hedwig, 34, 80-81
 Heshis Selkovich, 36
 Horodlo Union: obligations of, 37, 38; purpose of, 37; rights of, 37, 38; and Poland, 38, 88; renewal of, 45; and Catholic Church, 83-84

 Iakob Zakharievich, 104, 123n78, 132n109
 Iakub, Bishop of Vilna, 36, 121n30
 Iakub Ivashentsov, 105, 106
 Iaroslavl', 88
 Ilia Viachkevich, 113n11
 Inheritance, right of, 113n11
 Innocent III, Pope, 80, 81
 Iona, Metropolitan, 86, 87, 89, 102
 Iosif Bolgarinovich, Metropolitan, 88, 89
 Isaki, Bishop of Briansk, 96
 Isidor, Metropolitan, 82, 83, 85
 Istoma, Andrei, 130n74
 Iundilovich, Mikolai, 114n61
 Iuri Andreevich, 115n63
 Iuri Romeikovich, 130n74
 Iuri Zakharich, 100, 105
 Iushko L'vovich, 36
 Ivakino. *See* Markino
 Ivan III: and Tatars, 88; and Tver, 99; and Mezetskys, 100, 101; and Mozhaiskys, 102, 103, 104, 105; and Alexander, 104; and desertion, 105; and religious pressure, 123n78, 79; and Odoevskys, 129n74; and Viazemskys, 129n74; and Mosal'skys, 130n74
 Ivan Borisovich, 105
 Ivan Olgimuntovich, 36, 126n19
 Ivan Soltanovich, 123n63
 Ivashko Pashkevich, 115n63
 Ivashko Rusinovich, 115n63

 Jacob, Bishop of Vilna. *See* Iakub
 Jagailo: and Privilege of 1387, 34, 35; and Gedeminovichi, 35, 95; and Horodlo Union 37, 38; and Samogitian Privilege of 1492, 44; and Vitovt, 50, 119n2; and Catholic Church, 80-81; and Orthodox Church, 84; and nobility, 85; and Skirgailo, 94, 119n3; and Krevo Union, 119n7; and religion, 121n6
 Jews, 88
 John XXIII, Pope, 80, 82
 John, Bishop of Messina, 82

 Kadigrob, Anton, 127n48
 Kalusovsky, Man'ko, 21, 114n61
 Kamenets (district), 11, 15, 53
 Kamenets (town), 54
 Kapusta, Timofei Ivanovich, 22, 26, 115n63
 Karachevsky, Vasilii, 16, 19, 113n11
 Karachevskys, 8
 Karachov, 104
 Karp Karpovich, 31
 Kasimov, 3, 87
 Kazan, 100, 105
 Keistut, 7, 34, 50
 Kezgailo Volimuntovich, 36, 52
 Kgintsevichi, 112n8
 Khlepen', 130n74
 Khlepensky, Aleksandr Borisovich, 130n74
 Khodkevich, Alexander Ivanovich, 30, 91, 92, 123n63
 Khosttsi, 100, 101, 127n58
 Khotetov, 97
 Khotetovsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, 96, 97
 Khotetovskys, 8
 Khotimil', 104
 Khrachov, 104
 Khrebtovich, Vasilii Bogdanovich, 115n61
 Khvostovichi, 128n74
 Kiev (province): local government, 8-14 *passim*, 53-59 *passim*, 109; and land grants, 22, 29, 30, 32, 33, 91, 92; and Privilege of 1434, 39; local upheaval, 51, 52; and Tatars, 88; and Orthodox Church, 90; and desertion, 99; and I. L. Glinsky, 105; and centralization, 107
 Kiev (town), 14, 50, 86, 101, 122n49
 Kievo-Nikolaev-Pustynsky Monastery, 90, 91
 Kirdeevich, Olizar Shilovich, 20-21, 22, 92

INDEX

- Kletsk (principality), 10, 52
 Kletsk (town), 53
 Klimiatin, 26, 27
 Klochko, Voitekh Ivanovich, 114n61
 Kobrin (principality), 10, 11, 90
 Kobrin (town), 7
 Kobrinskaia, Anna Semionovna, 30, 99
 Kobrinskys, 30
 Koidanov, 52
 Koilensky, Bogush Sachkovich, 21, 115n63
 Koilensky, Tomko Sachkovich, 21, 115n63
 Kolontaev, Semion, 115n63
 Kopochevskii, Iatsko Vasilievich, 115n63
 Koribut, Dmitri, 95
Korm, 12
 Kosel'sk, 128n74
Koshatin, 104
 Koshka, Ivashko, 100
 Kostiuszko Volfromeevich, 115n63
 Koter, 100, 127n58
 Kovno (prefecture), 9, 10
 Kovno (town), 14
 Kovyln'ia, 128n74
 Kozel'sk, 50, 51, 53
 Kozel'skys, 8, 97
 Kozeniat, Iuri, 16
 Krasnosel'sk, 55, 56
 Kremenets (district), 10, 20, 51, 54
 Kremenets (town), 14, 50, 53, 54
 Krevo, 14
 Krevo Union of 1385, 34, 81, 83, 119n7
 Krichov, 52, 53
 Krokotko, Ivan Dmitrievich, 115n63
 Kromsky, Andrei, 26, 105
 Kroshinsky, Ivan Filippovich, 115n62
 Kroshinsky, Konstantin Feodorovich, 115n61
 Kroshinsky, Timofei Filippovich, 115n62
 Ktsin, 128, 129
 Kulikovo, battle of, 125n1, 7
 Kynunt, 36

 Labodin, 100, 101, 127n58
 Land grants: and rights, 17, 30, 43-44, 90-91, 120n32; types of, 17; chronological grouping of, 18; recipients of, 19, 20-21, 22, 24, 25, 31-32; distribution of, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31-32; and military service, 28, 44; grants by nobles, 29; and central government, 33, 107-10; and Privileges, 41-47 *passim*; and nobility, 48, 49, 109, 110; and Church, 124n91, 125n141
 Lida, 14
 Lingven, Semion, Olgerdovich. *See* S. O. L. Mstislavsky
 Lipitsy, 129n74
 Lithuania: desertion before 1377, 2; and Moscow, 3, 97, 102; defined, 7; administration of, 9-15 *passim*; laws of, 34; and Privilege of 1387, 35; and Poland, 45; and oecumenical union, 84; central government of, 51-53, 107-08; local government, 112n6
 Liubech, 55, 57, 104
 Liubutsk (district), 11, 54, 126n23
 Liubutsk (town), 50, 53
 Loginesk, 128n74
 Lublin, 37
 Luchino, 55, 128, 129
 Ludov, Feodor Ivanovich, 115n61
 Lugan', 128n74
 Lukomskvs, 11, 99, 100
 Lutovizh, 44
 Lutsk (district): local government, 9, 10, 14, 15, 119n16; and land grants, 19-25 *passim*, 30, 41; and Vitovt, 50; and Orthodox officials, 54, 85; and Jagailo, 84; and centralization, 107
 Lutsk (town), 8, 14, 53
 Lychino, 128n74

 Magdeburg Law, 13
 Markino, 101
 Martin, Bishop of Samogitia, 45, 88
 Martin V, Pope, 80, 81-82, 89
 Matsko Grin'kovich, 115n63
 Matvei, Bishop of Vilna, 82, 122n30
 Matvei Mikitinich, 115n61
 Mednik, bishopric of, 122n37
 Mel'nik, 10, 13
 Mengli-Girei, 88, 101
 Mensky, Urustai, 96, 97
 Merech, 105
 Meshchovsk, 100, 101, 127n48, 129n74
 Mezetsky, Andrei Vsevolodovich, 100
 Mezetsky, Feodor Feodorovich, 101, 127n58
 Mezetsky, Ivan, 127n58
 Mezetsky, Ivan Andreevich, 101
 Mezetsky, Ivan Feodorovich, 100
 Mezetsky, Mikhail Romanovich, 100, 101, 127n56
 Mezetsky, Peter Romanovich, 100
 Mezetsky, Piotr Feodorovich, 100, 101, 127n58
 Mezetsky, Roman, 127n58
 Mezetsky, Semion Romanovich, 100, 101
 Mezetsky, Vasilii Feodorovich, 100
 Mezetskys, 8, 100-02, 126-27n48, 130n74
 Mikhail Kostiantinovich, 20-21, 25
 Mikhail Olel'kovich, 86, 99, 123n63
 Mikhail Sigismundovich, 52, 53, 86
 Mikhail Vasilievich, 114n61
 Mikolai Dorkgeich, 114n61
 Milush, 36
 Mindovg, 80
 Minigailo Gedigoldovich, 36
 Minsk (principality), 11, 15, 55, 112n7
 Minsk (town), 14
 Misai, Bishop of Smolensk, 102
 Misail, 86
 Mitko Semionovich, 115n63
 Mogiliv, 15
 Mongols, 111n7
 Montovtovich, Iuri Mikhailovich, 57, 92
 Montovtovich, Stanislav Bartoshevich, 57
 Montygirdovich, Petrash, 51, 59
 Montygirdovich, Piotr Ivanovich, 54, 107

INDEX

- Moreva, 99
Mosalsk, 104, 130n74
Mosalsky, Dmitri Ivanovich, 130n74
Mosalsky, Feodor, 26, 130n74
Mosalsky, Iuri, 130n74
Mosalsky, Ivan Feodorovich, 130n74
Mosalsky, Mikhail, 130n74
Mosalsky, Piotr Mikhailovich, 106, 130n74
Mosalsky, Timofei Vladimirovich, 127n48, 130-31n74
Mosalsky, Vasilii Feodorovich, 130n74
Mosalsky, Vasilii Mikhailovich, 130n74
Mosalskys, 8, 130-31n74
Moscow: rise of, 3; and Lithuania, 16, 86, 94, 102; power of, 97; *passim*
Moshchinovich, 130n74
Mozhaisky, Andrei Vasilievich, 130n74
Mozhaisky, Ivan Andreevich, 18, 27, 56, 102-03, 112n10, 116n101, 128n74, 131n89
Mozhaisky, Semion Ivanovich: and land grants, 22, 27, 115n63; appointed prefect, 56; granted Chernigov, 59, 115n61; and Alexander, 89; attacked Meshchovsk, 100; desertion of, 102-05, 123n78, 131n74, 132n109, 117; and A. I. Viazemsky, 129n74
Mozhaiskys, 25, 112n3
Mozyr, 55, 57
Mstislavl', 8, 10, 52, 53, 90, 91, 92, 128n74
Mstislavsky, Iuri Semionovich Lingven, 23, 52, 53
Mstislavsky, Ivan Iur'evich, 92
Mstislavsky, Semion Olgerdovich Lingven, 52
Mstislavskys, 30
Mtsensk (district), 11
Mtsensk (town), 50, 54
Mushchich, Peter, 20
- Narimuntovich, Mikhail Romanovich, 101
Nedokhodov, 128, 130, 131n74
Neliub. *See* A. I. Olgimuntovich
Nemchinovskii dvor, 128n74
Nemerski, 100, 127n58
Nemir Rezanovich, 20, 36
Nemirovich, Andrei Iakubovich, 57
Nemirovich, Butrim Iakubovich, 115n62
Nemirovich, Iakub Ivanovich, 56, 115n62
Nemirovicha, Iadviga Iakubovna, 115n62
Nesterevich, Grin Ivanovich, 115n63
Nesterevich, Semion Ivanovich, 115n63
Nesvitsky, Piotr, 51
Nicholas, Bishop of Vilna, 122n30
Nicholas V, Pope, 79, 82-83, 85
Nikifor Semionovich, 115n63
Nikolaevsky-Pustynsky Monastery, 27, 30
Nikolai, Bishop of Samogitia, 84, 122n30
Nobility: categories of, 16-17; and land grants, 25; and laws, 34; Union of Horodlo, 37; Privilege of 1447, 40-41, 43; Samogitian Privilege of 1492, 44-45; land grants and Privileges, 46-49, 107-08; in *rada*, 47; and centralization, 53, 107; desertion of, 107-08
Nobility, Catholic: in *rada*, 8, 9, 47; land grants and Privileges, 46; and West Russian nobles, 47; and Orthodox nobles, 108-109
Nobility, Orthodox: in *rada*, 9; rights of, 108-09; appointment of, 109
Nobles, feudal: 16, 18
Normanist controversy, 1
Novgorod, 3, 88, 95, 112n3
Novgorod-Litovsk, 7, 10, 14, 105
Novgorod-Seversk, 8, 95
Novoeselo, 100, 127n58
Novoinovich, 112n8
Novokreshcheny, Ivan, 115n61
Novosel'e, 84
Novosilsky, Feodor L'vovich. *See* Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky
Novosilskys, 8, 25
- Obolensky, Vasilii, 130n74
Obolitsy, 55
Odoev, 84, 129n74
Odoevskoe mesttso, 129n74
Odoevsky, Feodor Ivanovich, 129n74
Odoevsky, Feodor L'vovich. *See* Feodor L'vovich Vorotynsky
Odoevsky, Ivan Iur'evich, 129n74
Odoevsky, Ivan Semionovich, 129n74
Odoevsky, Mikhail Iur'evich, 129n74
Odoevsky, Piotr Semionovich, 129n74
Odoevsky, Semion Ivanovich, 100, 129n74
Odoevsky, Vasilii Semionovich, 129n74
Odoevskys, 8, 25, 102, 126-27n48, 129n74
Oecumenical union, 88, 89, 93, 123n63, 75, 124n86
Ogdyrev. *See* Govdyrev
Oka, Upper, 109-10
Olbracht, Ian, 88
Olel'ko Vladimirovich, 52
Olel'kovich, Semion Mikhailovich, 22, 59, 99, 107, 115n63
Oleshnia, 100, 101, 127n58
Olgerd, 3, 7, 79, 83, 84, 86
Olgerdovich, 90, 91, 92
Olgimuntovich, Alexander Ivanovich, 96
Olita, 114n61
Olizalov, Iur'i, 130n74
Olizar Vasil'evich (Vessilitsky?), 36
Oren, 127n58
Ornery, 100, 127n58
Orthodox: and Catholic pressure, 3-4, 110; and Privileges, 49; and Svidrigailo, 53; and local government, 54, and Catholic officials, 54-55, 56, 58, 59; and Lithuania, 87
Orthodox Church: and land grants, 32, 86, 90, 92; Pledge of Lithuanian nobility of 1401, 36; charter of Jagailo, 39; Privileges of 1432 and 1434, 39; Horodlo Union, 45; defined, 79; and Catholic Church, 79, 82, 83, 85, 89-90, 92, 108-109; and papal policy, 79, 82; and West-Russian nobles, 79; and Council of Florence, 82; and Lithuanian government, 83; and union, 84, 124n86;

INDEX

- toleration toward, 84, 85, 88; and Casimir, 86, 87; and Alexander, 89; rights of, 90, 91-92, 122n48; position of, 93, 125n142; and desertion, 105; building of churches, 125n141
- Oshchitesk, 130n74
- Oshmiany, 52
- Ostrozhsky, Feodor Danilovich, 50
- Ostrozhsky, Konstantin Ivanovich, 55, 115n61
- Otto, *starosta* of Galich, 31
- Ottoman Turks, 79, 81
- Ovruch', 53, 56
- Ozeresk, 128, 129n74
- Ozhia, 105
- Paleologus, John, 81
- Paletsky, Feodor, 99
- Papal policy, 79-83 *passim*
- Parchov, 37
- Patrikei Narimuntovich. *See* P. N. Zvenigorodsky
- Patsovich, Iuri, 54, 107
- Paul II, Pope, 86
- Pavsha, Mikhail, 26, 27, 30
- Perelom, 105
- Peremyshl', 21, 97, 113n42, 127n48, 128, 129n74
- Peremyshl'sky, Semion, 96, 97, 126n36
- Peremyshl'skys, 8
- Pereslavl', 16, 84, 94, 125n7
- Pestnoi, Vasilii Davidovovich, 131n74
- Peter, Bishop of Vilna, 122n30
- Petukha, Alexander, 114n61
- Pius II, Pope, 86
- Pimin, Metropolitan, 83
- Pinsk, 7, 8, 10, 11, 50
- Pinsky, Feodor Iaroslavovich, 31
- Pinskys, 16, 107
- Piotr Borisovich, 105
- Pledge of Lithuanian nobility of 1401, 34, 36, 96
- Pleshcheev, Peter, 104
- Podliash'e, 10, 12, 13
- Podolia: division of, 8; local government, 10, 11, 53, 56, 58, 59; and Vitovt, 50; and Svidrigailo, 51; and Orthodox, 53; and centralization, 107; rights in land grants, 113n20
- Poland: and desertion, 3; Privilege of 1387, 35; Pledge of Lithuanian nobility of 1401, 36; Horodlo Union, 38; Samogitian Privilege of 1492, 44; union with Lithuania, 45
- Poles, 40
- Poles'e, 10
- Polotsk (province): location, 7; local government, 9-15 *passim*, 54, 55, 57; land grants, 22, 23, 30, 32, 33, 91, 92; Privilege of 1434, 39; nobility, 45; local upheaval, 51; and I. S. Mstislavsky, 52; Orthodox Church, 90; and Andrei Polotsky, 94
- Polotsk (town), 14, 50
- Polotsky, Andrei Olgerdovich, 94, 107, 125n1
- Polotsky, Feodor Borisovich, 100
- Polotskys, 30
- Polozovich, Ivashko, 115n62
- Polozovich, Sen'ko (Semion), 58, 114n61, 115n62
- Polozovich, Shchasnyi, 115n62
- Popova Gora, 104
- Poryski, 129n74
- Prelai, 55
- Princes, autonomous, 16, 18, 95-98
- Princes, regional, 16, 18, 107
- Priveredovo, 17
- Privilege of 1387: provisions of 12; purpose, 34; rights of, 34-35; results of, 36; and Orthodox, 49; and Catholics, 49; and papal policy, 81; and Lithuanian policy, 83; right of inheritance, 119n17
- Privilege of 1413, 12, 49
- Privilege of 1432, 38, 108
- Privilege of 1434: and land grants, 18; purpose, 38; related documents, 38-39; recipients of rights, 39; provisions of, 39; and Privilege of 1447, 41; and Catholic nobility, 46, 49; and Orthodox nobility, 46, 49, 85, 93, 108; and desertion, 58; services, 120n48
- Privilege of 1447, 12, 39-43, 85, 120n32, 36, 122n48, 123n67
- Privilege of 1492, 42-47, 88, 123n67
- Privileges: rights in, 43-44, 118n142, 120n32; military service, 44; and nobility, 48, 49, 107-08, 109, 110
- Privileges of 1506, 45-47
- Pronsk, 16, 84
- Pronskys, 8
- Pskov, 3, 94, 95, 96, 112n3
- Putiatic (Putiata), Dmitri Ivanovich, 26, 56, 115n61
- Putivl': land grants, 21; local government, 53, 58, 59; and Muscovite expansion, 106
- Putivil'sky, Feodor, 96
- Putogin, 131n74
- Rada*, 8, 9, 15, 42, 47, 112n4
- Radivil, 36
- Radivil, Mikolai, 54, 114n61
- Radogoshch, 105
- Radun, 53
- Ren'. *See* Oren
- Riapolovsky, Semion Ivanovich, 100, 105
- Riazan, 3, 84
- Riazansky, Oleg, 95
- Riurikovichi, 97
- Roman, Metropolitan, 83
- Roman Mileikovich, 36
- Rome, 79
- Ros', 55
- Roslavl', 96, 105
- Rostov, 3, 88
- Rostovsky, Alexander Vladimirovich, 105
- Ruka. *See* Uruga
- Ruta. *See* Uruga
- Rutsa. *See* Uruga
- Rzhev, 130n74

INDEX

- Sakovich, Andrei Iuchkovich, 52, 53
 Sakovich, Bogdan Andreevich Iuchkovich, 103
 Samogitia: and Lithuania, 7, 54; local government, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 55, 57, 119n16; local upheaval, 51; and Casimir, 52; bishopric of, 122n37
 Samogitian Church, 84
 Samogitian Privilege of 1492, 44-45
 Samogitians, 80
 Sbigneus, 84
 Semashko Epifanovich, 20-21, 25, 113n38
 Semion Iamuntovich, 36
 Semion Olgimuntovich, 36
 Semion Romanovich, 92
 Sen'ko (Semion) Polozovich, 58, 114n61, 115n62
 Sen'ko Terekhovich, 114n61, 115n63
 Sen'ko Zherebiatich, 105, 106
 Seredee, 130n74
 Serensk, 129n74
 Serezh, 52
 Serpeisk, 128n74
 Shchasnyi Polozovich, 115n62
 Shemiaka (Shemiakin), Dmitri, 87, 102, 103, 112n3
 Shemiaka, Iuri, 87
 Shemiakin (Shemiachich), Vasilii Ivanovich, 89, 104, 123n78, 131n74, 132n109, 110, 117
 Sherepov, 106
 Shliager, Gendrik, 114n61
 Shugailo, 36
 Sidi-Akhmet, 103
 Sigismund: Privilege of 1434, 18; and Svidrigailo, 19, 20, 97; and land grants, 21, 22, 30, 90-91, 92; Horodlo Union, 38; Privileges of 1506, 45; and centralization, 51-53, 108; and Orthodox, 85, 89, 90; and M. L. Glin-sky, 105; and Poles, 120n50
 Sigismund, Emperor of Holy Roman Empire, 80
 Sil'kovichi, 100
 Sixtus IV, Pope, 79, 86
 Skirgailo, 95, 119n3, 126n23
 Slavophiles, 1
 Slobodka, 106, 130n74
 Slonim, 15
 Slutsk, 7, 10, 90
 Smolensk (province): capture of, 3; location, 7; local government, 9-14 *passim*, 52-59 *passim*, 109; and land grants, 22, 25, 29, 32, 33; Privilege of 1434, 39; and privileges, 46, 118n142; local upheaval, 51; famine, 52; and Catholics, 53; and Orthodox, 54; and centralization, 107; and services, 110; 95, 122n49, 128-29n74, 130n74
 Smolensk (town), 14
 Smolensky, Gleb Sviatoslavovich, 96
 Smolensky, Iuri Sviatoslavovich, 95, 96, 107
 Sologub, Iuri Andreevich, 115n63
 Sokolin, 100
 Sokolinsky, Andrei, 26, 115n62
 Sokolinsky, Semion Feodorovich, 99, 115n62
 Sokolinsky, Vasilii, 26, 115n62
 Sopega, Ivan Bogdanovich, 55
 Sopega, Ivan Semionovich, 114n61, 115n62
 Sopega, Vasilii Semionovich, 115n62
 Spassky Monastery, 30
 Stanislav Bartoshevich, 59
 Starodub: location, 8; and I. A. Mozhaisky, 18, 103; and Mikhail Sigismundovich, 52; Muscovite attack, 94; and Svidrigailo, 96-97; and S. I. Mozhaisky, 104; and Alexander, 126n25
 Starodubsky, Alexander Patrikeevich. *See* A. P. Zvenigorodsky
 Strezhich, Andrei, 31
 Sukinichi, 100, 127n58
 Svidrigailo: and land grants, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 32, 41, 124n91; Privilege of 1434, 38; as regional prince, 50; as Great Prince, 51, 53; and local officials, 57; and Orthodox, 59, 84, 85, 90; and Casimir, 86; Briansk and Starodub, 96-97; desertion of, 96, 97, 108; Catholics, 109; and union, 122n49
 Svidrigailova, princess, 17
 Talnush, 36
 Tamerlane, 82
 Tannenberg, first battle of. *See* Grünwald
 Tatars, 3, 40, 87, 88, 102, 105, 112n3, 126n48
 Teutonic Knights, 80, 81, 82, 87
 Teutonic Order, 3, 7, 34, 96, 97
 Thorn (Torun), First Peace of, 84
 Time of Troubles, 111n1
 Tolokonsky, Pashko Radivonovich, 115n63
 Toropets, 7, 11
 Torzhok, 95
 Treaty of 1494, 100, 129n74
 Troki (province): location, 7; local government, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 50, 55, 57; land grants, 22, 91, 92; and Keistut, 34; Horodlo Union, 37; Privilege of 1434, 39; and Orthodox, 49
 Troki (town), 8, 14, 50
 Trubchevsk, 8, 50, 51, 94
 Trubetskoi, Dmitri, 125n7
 Trubetskoi, Ivan Iur'evich, 26
 Tsamblak, Metropolitan Gregory, 84, 122n40
 Tver, 3, 88, 99
 Turov, 7, 8, 10
 Ugrinovsky, Matvei Mitkovich, 115n63
 Ukraine, 111n1
 Urban VI, Pope, 79, 80, 81, 121n6
 Uruga, 100, 101, 127n58
 Ust'e, 100, 101, 127n58
 Utsiana, 105
 Uzheperet, 128n74
 Varangians, 111n4
 Vasilii Tolkachevich, 27
 Vasilii I, 51, 95, 96
 Vasilii II, 52, 98, 102, 103, 112n3

INDEX

- Vasilii III, 89
 Vasilii Semionovich, 115n63
 Vasiliishki, 105
 Vasilissa, 97
 Vasko Isakovich, 114n61
 Velikie Luki, 130n74
 Velikoe Pole, 130n74
 Venitsa, 11
 Vereisky, Vasilii Mikhailovich, 22, 115n63
 Vereiskys, 112n3
 Veshko, 36
 Vessilitsky, Olizar Vasil'evich. *See* Olizar Vasil'evich
 Veydimin, 36
 Vezhichna, 128, 129
 Viatslav Dimitrovich, 31
 Viazemsky, Andrei Iur'evich, 129, 130
 Viazemsky, Mikhail Iur'evich, 127n58, 130n74
 Viazemsky, Semion Mstislavich, 95, 96
 Viazemsky, Vasilii Iur'evich, 129, 130
 Viazemskys, 129, 130
 Viazma, 7, 11, 129-30n74
 Vilna (province): local government of, 9, 10, 12, 15, 55, 57; and land grants, 22, 24, 25, 29, 93; and Horodlo Union, 37; Privilege of 1434, 39; and nobility, 49; 112n7
 Vilna (town), 8, 14
 Vishtortovichi, 112n8
 Vitebsk (province): and nobility, 5, 45; local government of, 9-14 *passim*, 50, 55-59 *passim*; and land grants, 33; and Orthodox, 89; and F. I. Bel'sky, 99
 Vitebsk (town), 14, 50
 Vitovt: and land grants, 24, 28, 32, 113n11; and nobility, 29; and Jagailo, 34, 94, 119n2; and Gedeminovichi, 35, 51; and Pledge of Lithuanian nobility of 1401, 36; and Horodlo Union, 37, 38; and Privileges, 39, 44; and internal affairs, 50, 96, 97; and local government, 57; religious policy of, 81, 83, 84, 89, 90, 122n34, 122n37; and Casimir, 86; and Smolenskys, 95, 96; and centralization, 107, 108; and union, 122n40
 Vladimir (district), 10, 21, 22, 23, 25, 41, 113n42
 Vladimir (town), 44, 50
 Vladimir, bishopric of, 84
 Vladimir Andreevich, 94
 Vladimirovich, Semion Ivanovich, 26
 Vladislav. *See* Jagailo
 Vladislav III, 38
 Voinad Rushilovich, 36
 Voishiund, 36
 Volchko Mileikovich, 36
 Volkonesk, 105, 106
 Volkonsky, Roman, 26
 Volochko Kavodmovich, 36
 Volochko Konshovtovich, 36
 Volochko Utrovich, 36
 Volodimir. *See* Vladimir
 Volosovichi, 103
 Volsta Verkhniaia, 130n74
 Volynia (province): location, 8; and nobility, 5, 23, 109; local government of, 10, 15, 56, 57, 58, 59; and land grants, 22, 24, 31, 41, 92, 93; and Vitovt, 50; and Svidrigailo, 51, 54; and Orthodox, 53, 54; and Privilege of 1434, 58; and centralization, 107; 122n49
 Vorksla, battle of, 87, 95, 96
 Vorotynsk, 84
 Vorotynsky, Dmitri Feodorovich, 104-05, 128-30n74 *passim*
 Vorotynsky, Feodor L'vovich, 16, 27, 128n74
 Vorotynsky, Ivan Ivanovich, 127n48
 Vorotynsky, L'vov Vasil'evich, 131n89
 Vorotynsky, Semion Feodorovich, 105, 128-29n74, 130n74, 131n75, 81
 Vorotynskys, 8, 25, 127n48, 128-29n74, 130n74
 Vorotynsky-Peremyshl'sky, Ivan Mikhailovich, 100, 105, 128-31n74 *passim*
 Vynitsa, 53
 West Russians, 111n1
 Wrduych, Voijnis, 36
 Zaberezinsky, Ian Iur'evich, 45, 88, 105
 Zenovievich, Iuri Iur'evich, 90, 91
 Zhabin, 100, 101, 127n58
 Zheremin, 129n74
 Zheslavsky, Feodor Ivanovich, 55, 59
 Zheslavsky-Mstislavsky, Mikhail Ivanovich, 29, 31, 91, 115n61
 Zhiskovsky, Volchko, 20-21
 Zhitomir, 20, 41, 53, 56
 Zhizhmory, 55
 Zholvazhskaia, 106
 Zvenigorod, 11
 Zenigorodsky, Alexander Patrikeevich, 51, 96-97
 Zvenigorodsky, Patrikei Narimuntovich, 96-97, 126n25
 Zvenigorodskys, 94, 96-97
 Zviagol', 53, 56